Anti-Slavery Standard Vol. 13-14

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR. WITHOUT CONCEALMENT....WITHOUT COMPROMISE. EDMUND QUINCY, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

VOL. XIII. NO. 28. NEW YORK, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1852. WHOLE NO. 652.

Published weekly, on Thursday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 Nassau street, New-York. Terms, Two Dollars per annum. Printed for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by Norris & Johnston, printers, No. 21 Spruce street.

Pro-Slavery.

NORTHERN INTERFERENCE WITH SOUTHERN PROPERTY.

THE SOUTHERN VIEW OF THE LEMMON CASE.

To the Editor of the New York Herald.

Sir: The enlarged liberality which opens your columns to the expression of all shades of opinion not detrimental to the public welfare, as well as your soundness on the Southern question, embolden a Southerner to state frankly, but briefly, the impression which the late slave case here will produce on the Southern mind.

Nobly and manfully have you done your part throughout this perilous controversy—wisely have you warned your people of the dangers that lurk under this last high-handed outrage; but there are points connected with this matter which it is neither your province nor your privilege fully to consider or comprehend. Allow a Southern man, who has made it his business to study the temper of the Southern people in reference to this question, to throw out a few suggestions which may startle the conservative portion of your citizens into a sense of perils only the more imminent because unseen and unsuspected by those who mistake "acquiescence" for contentment—silence for satisfaction.

There are many Southerners at present in this city, and, after free conference with many of them, it appears that but one sentiment animates all, in relation to the outrage on the comity of friendly communities perpetrated by your courts on a Southern citizen, and, through him, upon the entire class he represents. It is important, for the preservation of the public peace, and of fraternal feeling—not to speak of the permanence of the Union—that the North should know what the South feels and thinks of this deliberate attempt to disfranchise her citizens in half of the national domain, even for purposes of temporary sojourn with their property. As equals the South entered this confederacy—as equals alone can their descendants be content to continue in it. Neither honour nor safety would permit them to sink to the state of a tolerated class—enjoying privileges by sufferance only—the Pariahs of the American Union. And it will be reduced to this, if they tamely tolerate such outrages on person and property as that of which Mr. Lemmon has been made the victim. This incident has occurred at a most inauspicious moment, just at a period when confidence was becoming restored—when the scars of old strife were healing over, and the era of good feeling was instaurated once more. The severity of the shock must be in proportion to the impatient bitterness of the disappointment. It would be equally idle and mischievous to disguise this fact from ourselves, for it cannot be ignored, even though attempts should be made to suppress its manifestations. The echo that will soon be sent back from the South will satisfy the most sceptical of this; and measures should promptly be taken by the conservative and honest portion of the Northern people and press, to mitigate this just and righteous anger. This is a question beyond the pacification of mere partisan politicians, fruitful in small expedients. It is not a question of policy or expediency, but of life or death. Therefore the means must be proportioned to the end to be attained.

How stands the case? After the general acquiescence of the South in the compromise measures, the endorsement of those measures as a settlement by the two conventions, and the emphatic ratification of the Democratic nominees by a vast majority of the American people, mainly on the issue of a cessation of agitation, it was hoped and believed by all, (except a few "extremists") that peace was once more to be restored "to this distracted country," and the South permitted again undisturbed to pursue the even tenour of her way. Acting under this conviction, the people of the South, with almost unexampled unanimity, have forgotten former feuds and political jealousies, and come up *en masse* to the support of those candidates and that party which represented that idea. But those hopes have been most suddenly chilled—that confidence most rudely shaken, by a gross and flagrant outrage, perpetrated in the face of day in this great metropolis of the North, by a portion of your people, whose course has been sanctioned and sustained by your courts of law—not of justice. The half insane threats and insults in presses like the *Times* and *Tribune*, emanating from men soured by disappointment, and smarting under a defeat aggravated by a sense of impotence, the Southern people could afford to smile at and despise. Not so with the solemn adjudications of your legal authorities—the act of open outrage, not alone stripping the individual of his rights and his property, but imperilling those of all similarly circumstanced with himself, and involving a principle as wide in its application as it must prove pernicious in its practical operation. We scorn the angry hissing of the blind viper, and scarcely deign to step aside to stamp our heel upon its head; but it would be madness to disregard it when coiled to strike, and danger and death lurk behind the warning. It is ours to look to self-preservation—yours to crush the crawling thing, or give an antidote to its poison. We do not ask for protection; all we demand is even-handed justice. We claim the observance, not alone of the articles of the late compromises on the subject of Slavery, but the recognition and enforcement of that earlier stipulation, those more solemn guarantees given to our fathers in the compromises of the Constitution, one of the most vital of which was the recognition of our right to have and to hold our slave property, and to enjoy its undisturbed possession, wherever and whenever not alienated by our own act or free will. What a mockery the last compromise, in relation to the rendition of fugitives, must be regarded, if local statutes are to be allowed to regulate the rights of property of citizens of other sovereign States, and local usage be all-sufficient to strip a Southern man of all his property when he ventures to trust it for an hour on free soil. The laws of Caligula were not greater traps for the unwary than such statutes as those under which Judge Paine permitted the Abolitionists to rob Mr. Lemmon of his property, under cover of law. For I will venture the assertion, that not ten of the ablest lawyers in this State were aware of the actual provisions of the code, or would countenance the construction which Judge Paine has put upon them. In a conflict of laws, the rule of interpretation requires that the higher of the two should prevail—the lesser yield to the greater; but here that principle has been reversed, and the "higher law," in its most offensive sense, has triumphed over all compromises, and all constitutional rights. Judge Paine himself has been placed in a painful position. He seems to be a man of strict narrow understanding, one of those mere lawyers described by Edmund Burke, whose sentences assimilates to that of a pin's point, and whose habits of training incapacitates him from rising above precedents and formulas to grasp the great general principles which modify or abrogate them. Like a smaller Gulliver in a larger Lilliput, he struggles painfully in the bonds of the little threads that tie his legal hands against morality, equity and justice, and his conscience and convictions are at conflict in the very decision which he admits to be an injurious, almost an unjust one in these words:

> Not thinking myself called upon to treat this case as a casuist or legislator, I have endeavoured simply to discharge my duty as a Judge in interpreting and applying the laws as I find them. Did not the law seem to me so clear, I might feel greater regret that I have been obliged to dispose so hastily of a case involving such important consequences. My judgment is that the eight coloured persons mentioned in the writ be discharged.

The subsequent proceedings furnish a sufficient commentary on the salve offered to Southern feeling, the proposition of appeal to the Supreme Court.

> Mr. Lepaugh, on the part of the claimants, said that his clients were law-abiding citizens, and should bow to the decision of his Honour, but it was his desire to propose to the other side to make some arrangements for an appeal to the General Term, and, by *certiorai*, to have the decision of his Honour reviewed by the Supreme Court of the State. The counsel would propose to the other side for these eight persons to remain in some place to be determined upon, until this decision could be reviewed.
>
> Mr. Jay said, if he had the power to make any arrangement, which he had not, he would make none. Mr. Jay then asked his Honour to allow costs against the claimants, and allow a counsel fee, which would be given to any fund received for the benefit of these persons.
>
> Judge Payne said he would allow no costs, if it depended upon his discretion, and he supposed it was a question of that kind, for he looked upon this as a case of great hardship to the claimants, and a case of great good fortune to the other eight persons. With respect to a counsel fee, he would consider what the law was and how far he had the power. After some other desultory conversation, his Honour said: "No one can feel more sensibly than I do for the unfortunate condition of these persons, and I must confess that the decision that I have given distresses me with the idea that they will not be very happy hereafter."

These extracts, from the proceedings, show the spirit that animated the judge, the counsel, and the audience. Comment upon them would be superflous. The finale was a fit pendant to the proceedings. It is triumphantly given in the *Tribune*, which gloats over this "glorious victory" as partial compensation of its late disgraceful defeat and repudiation, even by the party of which it is the organ and the incubus, or as also in the *Times*, a more Pecksniffian organ of higher law.

The sensation which this matter has created in the minds of the Southerners here is stronger than you can imagine; and we know how strong and bitter it must be at home, for it heaps injury on insult, and presents the Empire State in the attitude of the Jewish warrior towards the South, asking "Art thou in health, my brother," while the extended hand grasps the knife which is to give the thrust under the sixth rib. Many of us here and at home have put faith enough in the professions of our Northern brethren to believe that a returning sense of justice, prompted by generous as well as selfish motives, would cause them to co-operate with us in resisting this fell fanaticism, which would rule or ruin the North as well as the South, and perpetuate its policy at the cost of dragging down both in a common ruin. Therefore we co-operated ardently and zealously in the triumph of the Democratic party and the elevation of Pierce and King. Therefore we resisted the desperate Alabama movement in favour of Troup and Quitman, as calculated only to embarrass the action of friends, and give aid and comfort to our enemies. But if, in the very hour of victory, while Old Tammany is vocal with the shouts of gladness, and professions of fraternal harmony and the restoration of good feeling make the old wigwam resound to the voice of the young Democracy, a citizen of a Southern State is dragged with his slaves from shipboard, hauled before a court of justice, arraigned as a criminal, tried, condemned, stripped of his property, made the mock of a mob, and sent shivering and penniless from this seat and stronghold of Democracy, no strong hand interposing to shield or shelter him—many will say, then, in bitterness of spirit, "The hands are the hands of Esau, though the voice be the voice of Jacob."

What the South wants in such cases as this is what the dying giant of New England asked for in another sense, while life was ebbing from him: "It is not relief we want, we want restoration;" not the grudging privilege of the strict letter of our rights (though even that is denied us), but a restoration of the old spirit that gave unity of heart and of interest to this whole people. Without this the Union is but a galvanized corpse, and no amount of rant or cant can make it a living, breathing body, animated by an immortal soul, nor long protract its painful vitality. This plain language may shock the supersensitive, but it is the honest utterance of a plain man, who has done the Democratic party some service in this campaign, but would spurn it and scorn himself and his Southern brethren if the fear of a forfeiture of political position could seal his lips or theirs to the utterance of the truth. We, at the South, who have co-operated in this overwhelming Democratic triumph, have resting upon us a most heavy responsibility; and "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honour," are all at stake on the integrity of those in whom we have trusted. The South is not a soil that nourishes "spoilsmen"—her sons have fought for principle, not for pay—and to those principles they must still adhere to the bitter end. Withered be the hand, and palsied the tongue, of that Southern traitor who shall shuffle away from his responsibilities on this great question, through fear of compromising the candidates of his party or embarrassing the administration. The doom of Benedict Arnold shall be his forever.

Do not misunderstand my meaning, or that of my friends. We do not distrust the men whom we have aided in elevating to power, nor the mass of the party with which we have co-operated. We know that Franklin Pierce and Wm. R. King are true as steel on all questions connected with the compromises of the constitution; but in this matter they are powerless. It does not fall within their jurisdiction. As Greeley tauntingly replied to your just felicitation, that the South had now an abiding guarantee that her rights would be respected by the general government, neither the President or Vice President "have any power to overrule a judgment of the courts of New York." nor to reach the root of this evil. It is, then, not to the Administration that we are to look, but to the people of the Northern States, the great bulk of whom are pledged to us by the strongest of all possible pledges, express or implied. Without faith and moral honesty, what are promises or professions worth? And by works must that faith be judged. It is not necessary to go into a thorough examination of the grounds of Judge Paine's decision, which you have most properly characterized as "an Abolitionist victory coerced by law, not governed by justice"—the law of which even is so palpably unsound as not to be worthy of argument. The very citations made by Judge Paine show that, like Necessity (who seems his divinity), "he knows no law;" for the very current of decisions he quotes tells against him, and his special pleading is of the pettiest kind. It is the misfortune of those known to the profession as "case hunters," not to be able to distinguish between an apparent precedent and a real one, relying on the similarity of facts, while purblind as to the principle. The whole gist of the case was comprised by Justice Grier in a single paragraph, delivered in relation to one of somewhat similar character, a few days since, in the United States District Court of Eastern Pennsylvania, and he is not only a lawyer, but a jurist also. Passing judgment on the question of the right of a slaveholder to convey his property through a free State, Justice Grier thus concisely and clearly gives the true construction. It would have been well for Judge Paine to have swallowed and digested this, instead of bolting whole the crudities of the higher law interpreters of the constitution, who insist that Freedom is national, Slavery sectional, and whenever the two antagonize, the latter must go to the wall. Nay, had Judge Paine even taken the trouble to examine the interpretation given by the great Northern expounder of the constitution, Daniel Webster, he would have found there a refutation of his feeble fallacies, and a chart by which he might have steered clear of these shoals of Abolition which threaten the ship of State. He might then have learned, that what New England refuses, Old England does not deny; that Great Britain has made compensation for slaves taken from American ships in her West India islands. He might also have refreshed his memory with the Creole case, and Mr. Webster's emphatic declarations to Lord Ashburton on this very point. For, says Mr. Webster, speaking of the precise quibble under which Judge Paine seeks shelter,

> It may be said that in such instances, personal relations are founded on contract, and therefore to be respected; but that the relation of master and slave is not founded in contract, and therefore it is to be respected only by the laws of the place which it recognises.

He then sweeps away this cobweb thus:

> Whoever so reasons, encounters the authority of the whole body of public law from Grotius down, because there are numerous instances in which the law itself presumes or implies contracts, and prominent among those instances is the very relation which we are now considering, and which relation is holden by law to draw after it mutuality of obligation.

So says Daniel Webster. Will any sane man, North or South, weigh the opinion of Judge Paine (an opaque obscurity up to Saturday last) against that of Daniel Webster?

The opinion of Justice Grier is to the same effect. He says:

> This question depends on the law of Maryland, and not of Pennsylvania. The court cannot go beyond the statutes of the people where they escaped. We know of no law or decision of the courts of Maryland, which treats a slave as liberated who has been conducted by his master along the national road through the State of Pennsylvania.

A case precisely parallel, except the additional aggravation in the Lemmon case of boarding the vessel, and dragging master and slaves on the free soil, for the nominal redemption of the latter, and real ruin of both.

Well said the wise Scythian, centuries ago,

> "Laws are cobwebs which catch the flies, while the wasps break through them."

These Northern cobwebs have proved strong enough to hold Lemmon and his eight slaves—poor harmless Southern flies; but such wasps as Elizur Wright and the Christiana murderers break through them with impunity!

But this thing has gone far enough, and a stop must be put to it. This last outrage strikes at the very foundation of our institutions, and at the unity of this people. If Southern men are to be treated as aliens in the Northern States, and the comity exacted for them by Northern statesmen in treating with foreign powers to be denied them North of Mason and Dixon's line, we have indeed reached the crisis of this contest.

Again, then, earnestly we call on the true men of the North to stand up and show themselves—to vindicate our rights, and their own good faith, and not allow, through default or timidity, such stains as this to stand on their escutcheon and ours.

The writer of this feels he has the right, from his past and present connection with this matter, to throw out these suggestions, though personally there are few who have stronger inducements also to be silent. But the man who sees the first blaze of a midnight conflagration, and gives no warning, is criminal in the sight of man and God, if it finally wrap the city in flames. Such is the feeling that prompts the communication from

A Southern Citizen.

Clarendon Hotel, Nov. 16.

THE LEMMON INDEMNITY FUND.

We are happy to report so favourable a progress in the good work of reimbursing Mr. Jonathan Lemmon, of Virginia, for the loss of his property the other day, while touching at this port on his way to Texas, whither he was emigrating, with his family and servants. At this office there have been received subscriptions or pledges as follows:

Judge Paine	$100
Henry D. Lapaugh	50
T. O. Leroy & Co.	50
Walter R. Jones	50
J. W. Phelps	50
Jonathan Sturges	100
James Barnes	20
James Boorman (paid)	100
Trowbridge, Dwight & Co.	100
Jacob Le Roy (paid)	100
James Baker	50
Collected by Henrys, Smith & Townsend.	
Henrys, Smith & Townsend	$100
Furman, Davis & Co.	50
Perkins, Brooks & Co.	25
Wm. Smith Brown	25
Conkling & Co.	25
Cash, N.	25
Fisher & Cushing	25
Lewis B. Brown	25
George C. Dunbar	25
A friend (D)	5
Clark, Austin & Smith	15
Baldwin, Starr & Co.	25
A. Edwards & Co.	25
A. Wesson & Co.	20
Conkling, Barnes & Shepherd	25
Cash, F.	10
G. H. & J. Read	15
Catlin, Leavitt & Co.	25
W. A. Wheeler & Co.	10
Grant & Barton	25
Rankin, Duryee & Co.	50
J. M. Davis & Jones	25
Harral, Sproulls & Co.	25
Tulane, Baldwin & Co.	25
T. Smith & Co.	25
Cash, M.	10
Wm. Bryce & Co.	25
W. H. Carey & Co.	10
Ross & Leitch	25
Thomas Hunt & Co.	25
Wolfe, Gillespie & Co.	25
Wright, Betts & Co.	25
Hotchkiss, Fenner & Co.	50
Wolfe & Bishop	25
Stillwell & Montrose	10
Townsend, Arnold & Co.	25
W. G. Hunt & Co.	50
McGrath, Tweed & Co.	25
Richard Patrick & Co.	100
George & Bro.	25
E. Robbins	25
Nevins & Co.	25
E. P. Heyer & Co.	25
Clements & Hayden	25
Hopkins, Allen & Co.	50
Myers, Suydam & Knisely	25
A friend (S)	10
Whitlock, Nichols & Co.	50
Total thus far	$2,135

Thus we approach one half of the required amount ($5,000); and, judging from the excellent spirit which has been manifested on the subject, wherever it has been presented, we cannot doubt that the remaining $2,865 will be forthcoming with promptness and despatch. Messrs. Henrys, Smith & Townsend will continue their collections to-day, and we shall be most happy to receive additional pledges, or money, at this office. Mr. Lemmon will remain here until Monday, as the line in which he engaged and paid his passage, prior to his misfortune, had no vessel (besides the one that sailed the next morning) which was to depart at an earlier date.

We annex extracts from a few of the letters enclosing donations or pledges, and the others are in the same spirit.

Rye, 17th Nov., 1852.

Gentlemen: In your leader this morning I have read with great pleasure your suggestion to raise $5,000, to remunerate the unfortunate Mr. Lemmon for the robbery perpetrated upon him, under sanction of law; and I now enclose you my check for $100 for that purpose, and sincerely hope the stain will be washed away from the character of the State, by immediately indemnifying the injured man.

Respectfully, yours truly, Jacob Le Roy.

New York, Nov. 17, 1852.

Dear Sir: Put me down $100 for the Lemmon case. I enclose a check to your order. You can return it if your plan fails. But it must not fail.

Yours truly, James Boorman.

New York, 17th Nov., 1852.

Gentlemen: Please consider me a subscriber for one share, of $50, to the Lemmon fund, as mentioned in your paper of this morning. I would suggest, that if the fund is raised, the slaves ought to be considered free thereafter.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant, Walter R. Jones.

Nov. 17th, 1852.

Gentlemen: From your statement of the case of Mr. Lemmon, I am satisfied a great outrage has been committed upon him. Whatever the law may be, there has been a meanness about this transaction which is excessively mortifying to an honourable mind.

Should your plan to meet this case of (lawful?) injustice be adopted, you may put me down for one hundred dollars, or two hundred if it should be necessary. Yours truly, Jona. Sturges.

New York, Nov. 18th, 1852.

Gentlemen: In reply to your suggestion that the names of the contributors to the fund to indemnify Mr. Lemmon for the loss of his slaves be published, I beg to say that I have no objection, provided my views in relation to the law through which he has lost them be understood.

I very much doubt whether any good would come from allowing slaves to be brought into the free States, to remain for service in those States.

It must, I think, be evident to every man of reflection that it would be a source of constant irritation, just as it would to allow coloured *citizens* of the free States to settle in South Carolina.

My judgment would be against a law allowing citizens of the slave States to bring their slaves here to reside *temporarily*. It is quite a different thing to allow them to come here to remain a few hours, for the purpose of more convenient passage to another port in our own country.

Yours respectfully, Jona. Sturges.

—*Journal of Commerce, 17th inst.*]

LEMMON INDEMNITY FUND.

The fund is made up, the amount subscribed being $5,280—exceeding the sum proposed to be raised $280.

Before acknowledged	$2,135
From M. & N.	10*
W. W. Van Boskerck	25*
Charles M. Connoly	100*
Wright & Losee	25*
J. Howard Wells	25
Silas Brown	10*
A North	25
Barclay & Livingston	50*
Henry Coit & Son	50*
J. R. Jaffray & Sons	50*
Thomas Suffern	100*
Alex. T. Stuart & Co.	100*
C. E. & W. J. Babcock	25*
James Lee	25*
Wm. P. Miller & Co.	25*
Mortimer & Gawtry	25*
Pettits, Harris & Daniel	25*
J. H. Brower & Co.	100*
Cook & Smith	50
A. & A. G. Trask	25*
Archibald H. Lowery	25
Lottimer, Large, Ellery & Co.	100*
Udolpho Wolfe	50*
Three Germans, viz., L. B.	25*
G. E. K.	10*
F. A. S.	25*
Harbeck & Co.	50*
Robert Leech	15*
From Benton & Brothers	15*
Earle & Porter	50*
J. T. Farish	50*
Strang, Adriance & Co.	25*
Cash, J. F. & T.	20*
Stewart, Greer & Co.	50*
Butler & Winter	25*
N. B. Burtis	25*
Ralph Post	10*
Patteson & Price	50*
Equity, W. & G.	30*
Davis & Henriques	25*
Mallett & Paulmier	25
Dollner & Potter	50
Collected by Henrys, Smith & Townsend.	
Clark, Work & Co.	$25
D. R. Stanford & Co.	25
Stone, Starr & Co.	25
Cash (J. B. & Co.)	25
Cash (B. B. & Co.)	25
Cash (A.)	5
D. A. Cushman	20
Nelson & Co.	25
Horstmann Bros. & Allien	10
Fellows & Co.	25
Louis Fellows & Schell	10
Cash, C. H. & Co.	20
W. M. Lewis & Co	25
T. E. Bishop	25
W. B. Townsend & Co	25
Cash (S. H. & Co.)	26
Ingoldsby, Halsted & Co.	25
John McKesson	10
Free Democrat	10
R. W. Howes & Co.	25
Oscar Cheesman	5
Evans & Carman	20
O. & A. Wetmore & C.	10
Atwater, Mulford & Co.	25
Wisners & Phillips	10
Reid, Sprague & Co.	25
J. W. Whitlock & Co.	25
S. W. Osgood	10
Underhill & Lloyd	20
Fenner, McMillan & Arthur	20
A. & E. S. Higgins & Co.	25
Hiram Sears	10
E. Lambert & Co.	25
Cash (J. S. & Co.)	25
D. C. Hyde & Co.	25
Clark & West	25
Read, Taylor & Co.	20
Cash (S. C. & Co.)	25
Cash (S. H.)	10
Job Chandler & Foster	25
Way & Sherman	22
R. M. Bruce & Co.	25
Cameron, Hayward & Edwards	25
Cash (J. N. G.)	10
Tracy, Irwin & Co.	25
Cash (F.)	15
John J. Hovey	5
Sackett, Belcher & Co.	25
Smith & Payne	25
J. H. Westcott & Co.	5
Pierson & Jennings	10
J. H. Ransom & Co.	5
W. H. Weed & Co.	25
Spaulding, Thomas & Vail	25
Freeman & Bright	10
Cash (C.)	5
Acker & Harris	10
Oliver, Jones & Granger	10
Cash (L. C. & Co.)	25
Cash (M. & Co.)	10
G. L. Willard	10
Sackett, Lynes & Co.	25
McFarland & Bragg	25
Harral & Risley	15
Sherman & Collins	15
Swift, Waldron & Co.	25
Jas. R. Keeler & Co.	25
Geo. W. Pentz	10
Pentz, Poole & Goin	20
Cash (S. & G.)	10
T. G. Hodgkins	25
Caleb Barstow	10
Taylor & Ritch	25
Cash (W. H. T.)	25
Cash (A. & S.)	10
H. E. Diblee & Co.	25
N. L. McCready & Co.	25
Buckingham & Graham	25
Cash (B. & M.)	10
H. LeRoy Newbold	25
J. L. Cochran	10
Total	$5,280

*Paid.

Payments made at this office on subscriptions before acknowledged.

Robt. Leech	$15
Harbeck & Co.	50
Conklin & Smith	50
Trowbridge, Dwight & Co.	100

Conklin & Smith's subscription was credited, on Saturday, to Cook & Smith; and Robert *Leech's* ($15) to Robert *Leets*.

New York, Nov. 19, 1852.

To the Editors of the Journal of Commerce.

Dear Sirs: Inclosed you have thirty dollars ($30) towards the Lemmon Fund.

The decision of Judge Paine may be legal, but it does not carry out the spirit of the Constitution of United States, nor that of Equity.

New York, Nov. 20, 1852.

Messrs. Hallock, Butler & Hale.

Gentlemen: Please apply to the "Lemmon Indemnity Fund" the inclosed amount, fifty dollars ($50). Believing with many of your correspondents that Mr. Lemmon has been robbed of his property by trickery and the forms of law.

Yours truly, Stewart, Greer & Co.

Westchester, Nov. 20, 1852.

Messrs. Henrys, Smith & Townsend.

Gentlemen: Inclosed I hand you my check for $25 towards the "Lemmon Indemnity Fund." I am anxious, for one, to add my mite to repair a gross injury done a fellow citizen.

Respectfully yours, H. Le Roy Newbold.

The check of Messrs. J. H. Brower & Co. was accompanied with the following note:

45 South street, Nov. 19, 1852.

Gentlemen: We hand you herewith one hundred dollars, towards making Mr. Jonathan Lemmon good for the loss of his servants, under a legal decision of one of our State Courts—a decision, which in our humble opinion, could not have been otherwise. We know of several cases of servants having been brought here by their owners from the South, enticed away and not recovered. Nor do we understand the fugitive slave law, or the basis of it, to bear on such cases; but on the protection of owners whose servants run away, or are kidnapped from places where they are legally held to service. In this case, we take the broad ground that a master from another State cannot, of his own choice, bring his servants into a free State and hold them, any more than the citizen of the free State could hold slaves in it himself—that the laws of our State cannot protect a citizen of Virginia, any farther than the citizens of our own State under similar circumstances.

On the arrival of the "City of Richmond" here, while these persons were yet on board, her purser (as he said he was) called at my office to engage passage for Mr. Lemmon, his family, and these servants, in one of our vessels, for Galveston. The writer told him, at once, he feared Mr. Lemmon would lose the servants, and gave the reasons above stated; advising that they should be taken out of the city to a place of security without any delay. That although our vessel was not intended to sail for several days, we would despatch her immediately for a fair compensation, to accommodate the case. He appeared much surprised at our opinion, and stated that Mr. Lemmon had felt a perfect security that our laws would protect him. The case has resulted as we predicted. And while we fully sympathize with Mr. Lemmon (and will freely further contribute our fair share of expense to procure a reversal of Judge Paine's decision, if reliable counsel advise that it can be done), we cannot but condemn the great risk he voluntarily took upon himself of losing his property.

Nor are we of those who believe that our laws should be changed to give protection (if they do not do it already, as we think they do not) to masters in passing their servants through this city in transporting them from one slave State to another, because, notwithstanding the protection of law, we think we know enough of political Abolitionists to feel assured they would lose no opportunity to effect the escape or kidnapping of a negro in any way, to keep up a continual ferment of this question, to the irritation and disquiet of our friends of the South. We therefore prefer the preventive to the cure.

Very truly, your obedient servants,
J. H. Brower & Co.

Editors Journal of Commerce.

—[*Journal of Commerce.*

The Southern Press, South.

THE RECENT SLAVE CASE—DECISION OF JUDGE PAINE.

From recent manifestations of public opinion, we anticipated at least a temporary truce to the agitations of the Abolitionists. It was the fond hope of the country that the Compromise would be sustained in spirit and in letter, and that, if not from patriotic impulses, at least from the pressure of public opinion, the Anti-Slavery sentiment of the North would intermit its war upon the rights and feelings of the South and the peace of the Union. Again, however, has the fanaticism of Abolition, in defiance of the will of the people, and at this period of quiet and good feeling, kindled afresh the flame of sectional excitement by perpetrating an unparalleled outrage upon the rights and feelings of the South and the spirit of the constitution. It will be readily understood that we refer to the recent slave case in the Superior Court of New York. We propose to make this case the subject of brief comment, the text of which is the opinion of the judge published in another column. Whilst we deprecate the discussion of the Slavery question in any relation, and deplore the renewal of the Abolition agitation, and whilst we would in no manner contribute to revive this discussion and this agitation, yet imperative duty compels us courageously to confront any issue which may menace the peace of the Union.

A bare statement of the facts of the case under review will convey an adequate idea of the *judicial* outrage which has been recently perpetrated upon the constitution and the slaveholding States of the confederacy. A citizen of Virginia desires to fix his residence in Texas, and he has a few slaves which he wishes to take with him. After several vain attempts to secure a passage directly from Richmond or Norfolk to New Orleans, he concludes to go by sea to New York, and thence in a steamer to New Orleans. He arrives at New York in the Richmond City, and resolves to remain on board until the departure of the New Orleans steamship. Meanwhile, however, an Abolition society in New York have got intelligence of his movements, and have perfected a plan for robbing him of his property. While his slaves (eight in number) are lying on board the Richmond City, he is served with a writ of *habeas corpus*, sued out at the instance of a negro boasting the name of Louis Napoleon, who is instigated to the act by the Abolitionists. He brings his slaves before the judge, and pleads in response to the writ that they are his property; that he is a citizen of Virginia, and is merely passing New York *en route* for the State of Texas; that he has no intention whatever of sojourning in New York, and would not have touched at the port at all but from necessity. The case is argued before the court; the Abolitionists employ counsel to combat the rights of the owner, and successfully, too; for the court adjudges his slaves to be free, and sets them at liberty. But the case stops not here. A proposition is made by the counsel for the claimant to carry the case to the supreme tribunal of the State, and for this purpose he suggests that the slaves be retained in the custody of the inferior court until by *certiorari* the case be brought before a higher judicature. To this the Abolitionists object; the judgment of the court goes into effect, the slaves are sped away, and the owner is left in utter destitution by this act of judicial robbery.

These are the circumstances of a case which we presume to characterize as a most grievous injury and flagrant outrage upon the South and the bond of the Union. We do not propose at this time to argue in detail all the points of the case, nor to combat the grounds upon which the judge assumed under the circumstances to set the slaves free. We cannot forbear to observe, however, that the *law of nature*, upon which the learned judge lays such stress, does recognise the relation of master and slave; and that even if it did not, it could hardly operate to strip a citizen of his property in his own country, and in opposition to the guarantees of his own government. We had supposed that appeals to the "higher law" were employed only to give grace and fervour to the declamation of the fanatic; but we see it now presiding in the tribunals of the country, and determining the rights of citizens and the political privileges of States. Unless its ambitious spirit be humbled and crushed, it will rend asunder the fabric of the Union.

The court based its decision also upon a statutory enactment of New York, thus re-inforcing the higher by the lowest law—ignoring all the while, however, the obligations of the constitution and the Union. This provision is as follows:

> "No person held as a slave shall be imported, introduced, or brought into this State, on any pretence whatever. Every such person shall be free. Every person held as a slave, who hath been introduced or brought into this State contrary to the laws in force at the time, shall be free."

Now, it is obvious to any man who knows anything of the nature of the federal compact, that this local law of New York is in conflict, if not with the letter, with the spirit of the constitution of the United States, is at war with the object and intent of the federal Union. The constitution of the United States, which is the supreme law of the land, recognises and guaranties the right of property in slaves, and makes a common country of the different States. The State of New York is not content only to abolish Slavery within the sphere of its sovereignty, but assumes to deprive the citizen of another State of his property, if by any chance that property should be thrown under its jurisdiction, thus imposing a penalty upon what should be the unquestioned privilege of the citizens of the United States—to wit: to travel with their property in unmolested security throughout the length and breadth of a common country. When the federal constitution was adopted, and Virginia entered into a political copartnership with New York, Slavery existed in the latter State, and the Virginian might and did go thither with his slaves, and no man durst question his right of property. Since the adoption of the constitution New York, by her own act, has set free the slaves of her own citizens, and decreed that Slavery shall not exist, even for a moment and *in transitu*, within her jurisdiction; but this was manifestly in derogation of the rights enjoyed by the citizen of Virginia when the Union was consummated by the adoption of the constitution. Imagine that pending the discussion of the federal constitution by the convention of Virginia, a court of New York had made the decision just now announced for the first time: does anybody believe that Virginia would have consented to the Union? We say, now announced for the first time, because cases similar to the one under consideration have been repeatedly adjudicated in the courts of the non-slaveholding States, and heretofore the right of the master has uniformly been upheld. Notwithstanding, however, the force of invariable precedent—against the common understanding of the authors of the constitution—against the spirit of the constitution itself, and against the intent and harmony of the Union—it is now determined by the courts of New York that a Southern gentleman cannot set foot upon the soil of the State without incurring the penalty of a forfeiture of property! Most sincerely do we deprecate this decision; for we see it is but the torch wherewith to light again the flame of sectional agitation. If this principle is to prevail, the citizens of the different States are no longer citizens of a common country—the embargo of a higher-law decree intercepts all friendly and free communication between the North and the South—the people of New York regard the people of Virginia as aliens and foreigners. It were well if by some mode the patriotic people of New York could manifest their dissent from the higher law doctrines of their judge, and thus shield their State from the dishonour of being the first to raise again the banner of fraticidal strife. We appeal not to the South, which needs no spur to prompt the redress of its grievances, but to the North—from the intelligent and Union-loving citizens of the North we invoke some expression of indignant rebuke, which shall crush the schemes of the Abolitionists, and give assurance of the continuance of domestic peace and comfort.—*Washington Union.*

SLAVE CASE IN NEW YORK, AGAIN.

As we said in our article of yesterday, we have no doubt that this decision is as unconstitutional as it is contrary to reason and every sense of honour and justice that should ever characterize the relations between private individuals or States, or of a State and the citizens of other States.

This case came up by a writ of *habeas corpus*, requiring the owners of these eight slaves to bring the same before the Judge, with the cause of their detention, &c.

Judge Paine says:

"The respondent has returned to this writ, that said eight coloured persons are the property of his wife, Juliet Lemmon, who has been their owner for several years past, she being a resident of Virginia, a slaveholding State, and that by the Constitution and laws of that State they have been, and still are, bound to her service as slaves; that she is now, with her said slaves or property, *in transitu* from Virginia to Texas, another slaveholding State, and by the Constitution and laws of which she would be entitled to said slaves and to their service; that she never had any intention of bringing, and did not bring them into this State to remain or reside, but was passing through the harbour of New York, on her way from Virginia to Texas, when she was compelled by necessity to touch or land, without intending to remain longer than was necessary. And she insists that said persons are not free, but are slaves as aforesaid, and that she is entitled to their possession and custody."

Mark well the allegations contained in this answer of Mr. Lemmon, and especially that the owner "*was* COMPELLED *by* NECESSITY *to touch or land, without intending to remain longer than was necessary.*"

To this answer, the Judge says, "the relator has put in a general demurrer."

This *demurrer*, as Judge Paine and all lawyers well know, according to all the rules of pleading, admitted the *truth* of all the facts alleged in the claimant's answer (one of which is that the "owner was *compelled by necessity* to touch," &c.), and denied only that these were sufficient, *under the law*, to entitle him to a judgment. Thus the *issue* was made up. Let us see how the court disposed of it.

The counsel for the claimants in support of their claim cited three different cases.

[The *Enquirer* here quotes so much of Judge Paine's remarks as relates to these decisions, and adds:]

These decisions, whether founded upon positive law or not, breathe the spirit of the Constitution of the United States, which was adopted as a compromise between conflicting parties, and they address themselves to the common sense of every honest man who is uninfluenced by fanaticism. The first was given in 1829, when the subject of Abolition had not been agitated, and when this question could be considered calmly, and without prejudice; the other in 1843, before the promulgation of that "*higher law*" said to be above the Constitution, which governed alone by the doctrine that the end justifies the means, teaches that it is right to steal from the slaveholder his slaves, whenever and however it can be done, without regard to any civil compacts or guarantees whatever. This case presents the most *practical* illustration of this doctrine that this country has ever witnessed.

After thus stating them, Judge Paine says, "I admit that the principle of these cases is this,"

"That by the law of nations, an owner of a slave may, either from necessity on in absence of all intention to remain, pass with such slave through a State where Slavery is not legalized, on his way from one slave State to another, and that during such transit through the free State, the slave cannot assert his freedom."

He further admits that "writers of the highest authority, on the law of nations, agree that strangers have a right to pass with their property through the territories of a nation."

After these admissions, one might have supposed that he would have had no difficulty in deciding to restore these negroes to their owners. For if this right exists between nations or states *wholly foreign to each other*, surely it should exist between the several States composing this Union, having a common Constitution, and where this principle should be held in more sacred regard by the comity, courtesy and the common sense of justice.

But all this *must* be gotten over. If the predetermined conclusion cannot be arrived at by argument, it must be assumed. Then he says:

"But we are to look further than this, and to see what the law of nations is when the property which a stranger wishes to take with him is a slave.

"The property which the writers on the law of nations speak of is merchandise or inanimate things. And by the law of nature, these belong to their owner. But those writers nowhere speak of a right to pass through a foreign country with slaves as property. On the contrary, they all agree that by the law of nature alone no one can have a property in slaves"

First, he assumes that the property spoken of by the writers upon the law of nations is *merchandise* or *inanimate* things, which belong to their owner by the *law of nature*, and then concludes that, inasmuch as these writers nowhere *expressly* "speak of a right to pass through a foreign country with slaves as property," no such right exists.

Without stopping to inquire, we will say that all this *may* be correct, as applied to governments *wholly*

separate and distinct from each other, because, from the nature of things, they can have no law but the law of nations, which to them is what the "common law" was to England; differing widely in their domestic relations respecting the rights of property; and no one nation having the right to raise a standard for the rest, they can only be governed by the law of nature. But, whilst this may be correct, as between the United States, as a nation, and England, or as between England and France, it is wholly inapplicable to the condition and relations subsisting between the several States composing this Union. Will any one pretend that the relations between Virginia and Massachusetts upon the subject of Slavery are the same as those between Virginia and France? Surely not. The necessity, the reason for the law observed by independent governments, does not exist in the case of the several States of this Union, and hence the law is not applicable.

It is true that in many things these States are sovereign and independent of each other, that they have many rights with which even the federal government has no right to interfere—its powers being specific and limited; but, to distinguish the relations thereafter to subsist between these sovereign States, from those existing between the independent governments of the world, and for other purposes, the constitution of the United States was adopted. This instrument is, to the United States, as it regards the relations between themselves, what the law of nations, and of nature, they being one and the same thing, is to the world. Judge Paine admits that if the right of property in slaves was to be found in the law of nature, the law of nations would protect that property, in the possession of its owner, whilst in *transitu* through a strange State. That is, the law of nations will thus protect whatever the law of nature recognises as property. We have shown the necessity which called for the recognition of these laws by nations, and that no such necessity existed in the relations between these States, inasmuch as the written Constitution supplied, to these States, among themselves, the place of both. Then, if the Constitution guarantees the right of property in slaves in any portion of this Union, it intended to protect the same in the possession of the owner, when in *transitu* through any of the States. None will deny that the Constitution does recognise and guarantee such right—then the right of the owner to take the same through a free State, in passing from one slave State to another, follows, according to Judge Paine's own reasoning.

As if not entirely satisfied with his reasoning upon this point, the Judge then remarks:

"It remains for me to consider how far the local law of New York affects this case, and distinguishes it from the cases in Indiana and Illinois."

Upon this we shall make no remark, because, whether the statute of New York justified the decision or not, it was unconstitutional; and if it did, is the worst species of nullification.

We think that no one who has read this opinion could fail to have observed the evidences of a predetermination to come to the conclusion and decide this case as has been done, notwithstanding the *blowing of trumpets* and great preparation for a thorough investigation. It is exhibited by a seeming fondness to dwell upon such quotations as this—"That by nature all men are free"—and others like it, equally irrelevant. He gets over the case decided in Illinois by saying that the Judge decided that case "without due consideration."

When pressed upon the point that the rights of the owners of these slaves were secured, because their situation was one of *necessity*, he turns *advocate* as well as Judge. He had to admit that

"When such right grows out of necessity created by the *vis major*, it is a perfect right, and cannot be lawfully refused to a stranger. * * In this case it is insisted that the respondent came here with his slaves from necessity; the return having so stated, and the demurrer admitting that statement. It is perfectly true that the demurrer admits whatever is well pleaded in the return. But if the return intended to state a necessity created by the *vis major*, it has pleaded it badly; for it only alleges a necessity, without saying what kind of necessity; and, as it does not allege a necessity created by the *vis major*, the demurrer has not admitted any such necessity."

What right had he to *infer* that this necessity was not created by the *vis major*? They had put in the plea of *necessity*, it will be remembered, in the strongest terms, viz., that the owner "was *compelled by necessity*." How compelled or what constituted the necessity, it was not incumbent upon the respondent to say, unless the *fact* had been denied. This, the counsel for the negroes did not do, but admitted its truth, by a general demurrer. We do not care whether it was true, in point of fact, or not; it had been admitted by the counsel, and the Judge had no right to assume the contrary. And he could only so by becoming both advocate and Judge.

We have said this much, perhaps not without some feeling, but it is only that feeling which every indignant Southerner and friend of the Union has, when he sees such gross injustice done to the citizens of one section of this confederacy by those of the other.

We have not set down aught in malice, nor treated this subject in a captious or querulous spirit, but we deem it our duty, as it is of every journalist, to speak plainly, when we see the bonds which bind this Union together being severed by destroying that confidence and fraternal feeling which should ever characterize the relations between the citizens of the States.

This decision is much to be regretted, aside from its personal consequences, which are peculiarly painful, but we have not space to say more at present. We shall probably recur to the subject to-morrow.—*Richmond Enquirer, Nov. 17*

EFFECT OF JUDGE PAINE'S DECISION.—The *Howard Gazette* states that Mr. William J. Timanus, of Ellicott's Mills, who left that place a few days ago for New York, to embark for San Francisco, to superintend the building of light-houses on the Pacific coast, had intended taking with him a servant who has five years to serve, and the man was very anxious to go, but after taking him to Baltimore he was advised not to risk the trouble and expense of New York interference, and the man came back very reluctantly to Ellicott's Mills on Thursday morning. Mr. Timanus was accompanied by Joel Price, A. Dorsey, and Charles Hipsley. They sailed from New York on Saturday by the Isthmus route.—*Baltimore Sun.*

Selections.

A CLEAR CASE OF LIBEL.

[From the N. Y. Independent.]

IT is not pleasant to spread one's personal grievances before the public, especially when those grievances affect character; but in these days of libel and slander, especially as respects one's position on the Slavery question, modesty must yield to a sense of duty, and the individual must encounter an unwelcome publicity for the sake of the profession! The writer of this communication finds himself *libelled* by "an assault upon his Christian and ministerial character," most "injurious to his professional reputation and usefulness." At the late meeting of the "Congregational Union of England and Wales," held at Bradford, Yorkshire, he was unexpectedly called upon to make some remarks upon a Resolution on the subject of American Slavery, and spoke briefly of that system of enormities, just as he has been accustomed to write and to speak about it at home. He took occasion, however, to draw such distinctions as are quite familiar to the readers of *The Independent*, but not quite familiar to British ears, between governmental, ecclesiastical and moral action; to exhort the assembly to discrimination and kindness, and to expose the mistaken policy of Mr. George Thompson, M. P., during his late visit to America. For this he is denounced by the *Morning Advertiser*—a London journal next in circulation to the *Times*—as "one of the greatest stumbling-blocks in the way of the emancipation of the slave;" and, in language at once "untrue and slanderous," it "holds him up to the public in an odious light, by representing him as uttering sentiments that seem to justify or at least to palliate the cruelties" of Slavery. After rebuking the Congregational Union for admitting to its fellowship the abettors of Slavery, the *Advertiser* proceeds as follows:

"We observe that at the meeting of the Congregational body, to which we have thus been adverting, a New York divine, named THOMPSON, was received with open arms by the members who were present. Mr. Thompson appeared in the character of a delegate from the churches in the State of New York. Can any one furnish us with the antecedents of this Rev. gentleman? He made a speech on the occasion which, notwithstanding that it wore a sort of Anti-Slavery aspect, we do not altogether like. We suspect that this divine is one of those very moderate Anti-Slavery men, who are the greatest stumbling-blocks in the way of the emancipation of the slave. It looks rather suspicious that we should never have heard his name mentioned before, in connection with Anti-Slavery efforts in America, provided he be the devoted friend of the slave which he assures us he is. We wish the Rev. gentleman would answer us one question: Have you, Mr. Thompson, among the members of your church in the Broadway, any known holders of slaves, or avowed abettors of Slavery? Of one thing we are certain, that he does not belong to the Abolitionist party, and they, as we are bound to say, however much we may regret the amount of infidelity which is to be found in their ranks, are the only real, honest, uncompromising friends of the slave.

"But we defer any further observations respecting this American divine, until we can ascertain something more specific respecting his antecedents, than we know at present. If it shall turn out that he is not the man which, on the question of Slavery, he passes himself off for being, he and the Congregational Union shall hear from us again. Suffice it, in the mean time, to say that it looks very awkward and unpromising for the Anti-Slavery principles and conduct of the Rev. gentleman, that it was at his request that the reference to *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, which was originally in the resolution we have quoted, was expunged. Nor is it a presumption in his favour, that he had not a word to say in condemnation of the American slaveholding and Slavery-abetting churches. How, indeed, could he, when he was sent as a delegate to the Congregational Union here by the churches in the State of New York—many of which churches are steeped to the ears in the guilt of Slavery? But on these matters, we doubt not, we shall have more to say before the lapse of many days."—*Morning Advertiser, Oct. 28*, 1852.

The writer is not unused to a slanderous misrepresentation of his sentiments on the subject of Slavery; but so long as these were confined to the *New York Observer* and the *Journal of Commerce*, he "did not think they would produce an unfavourable impression on the public mind;" for "he did not suppose that these journals were believed where their character is known." Now, however, that a calumny appears in a journal of ordinary respectability and veracity, the case is quite altered; and he "feels himself compelled to demand a full and public retraction of the calumny referred to." Accordingly he has sent to the *Advertiser* a letter, of which the following is a copy:

MANCHESTER, Nov. 1, 1852.

To the Editor of the Morning Advertiser.

SIR: My attention has been called to your leader of Thursday last, in which you impugn both my sentiments and my honesty on the subject of American Slavery, and also impugn the recent action of the "Congregational Union" upon the same subject. I write this note mainly to correct a gross mis-statement in your closing paragraph. You say that "it looks very awkward and unpromising for the Anti-Slavery principles and conduct of the Rev. gentleman, that it was at his request that the reference to *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, which was originally in the resolution we have quoted, was expunged." I cannot account for a blunder on the part of your reporter or your informant, so utterly remote from the truth. While sitting as a guest upon the platform of the Union, a resolution touching American Slavery was put into my hands, with a request that I would second it. This I consented to do, though at the disadvantage of speaking before a strange, and to me a foreign, assembly, without premeditation. I consented simply because, as a Christian man and an American citizen, I am ready at all times to avow my abhorrence of American Slavery, and to contribute my mite toward any proper influence against it. The resolution contained a complimentary allusion to Mrs. Stowe, to which I made no reference in my remarks, except to testify to the truthfulness of her recent work, *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, and to its popularity and usefulness in the United States. As both Mrs. Stowe and her brother, Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, are stated contributors to the journal of which I am an editor, I felt gratified with the favourable notice of her book by the great body of the members of the Congregational Union; yet I inwardly deprecated the allusion to *Uncle Tom's Cabin* in the resolution, because I foresaw that it would be objected to upon general grounds, and that the ultimate modification or withdrawal of the formal compliment would be perverted against the body precisely as it has been. Of this, however, I *said* nothing. The mover of the resolution, Rev. Samuel M'All, of Nottingham, withdrew the clause referred to, for reasons which he has stated in the preface to his speech, since published. The chairman of the meeting, Rev. Dr. Harris, turned to me and asked if I—as the seconder of the resolution—would consent to its withdrawal. As a stranger, present by courtesy, I could but nod affirmatively; and I then withdrew from the house long before the vote upon the resolution was taken.

I would gladly close this note with this simple correction of an error in your article, were it not that the article contains also insinuations against my personal honour that demand a brief notice at my hands. You more than once intimate a suspicion that I am "passing myself off for being a different man on the question of Slavery from what my antecedents will warrant." And yet at the same time, you confess your entire ignorance of these "antecedents." I know not what are the laws of journalism in England, but the comity of the press—not to speak of Christian principle and the honour of a gentleman—would forbid me as an editor to throw out suspicions of the honesty of a stranger of whom I knew nothing, except that he was courteously received by a respectable body which had a right to know his standing, or to denounce the sentiments of that stranger without giving the reader an opportunity to judge of these sentiments for himself. Had you published my speech at Bradford as it is reported in the *Patriot* and in the *British Banner*, and accorded to me the common honesty that a Christian minister may be presumed to possess, you might then have concerned yourself as little about my "antecedents," as I shall concern myself about the consequents of your article.

It does not surprise me that my "antecedents" are not known to you. My position is simply that of a pastor in the city of New York, and of an editor of *The Independent*, a weekly religious journal; and there are many reasons why we in New York know more of you in London than you in London know of us. I have rather been surprised to find that my letters of introduction to gentlemen of the first respectability in London were altogether superfluous. They know my "antecedents," and they can judge, better than I, whether it is of any consequence that you should be informed of them.

To me, personally, this is not of the least consequence. I am not in England in the capacity of a public lecturer, and I have no favours to ask of the English public or the English press, and no motive to manufacture public sentiment or to court applause by putting on any disguise. In the United States my position on the subject of Slavery is perfectly understood by every man from Maine to Louisiana who takes any interest in the discussion of that subject; for not only has *The Independent* habitually avowed it, but the *Journal of Commerce*, the *New York Observer* and the *New York Herald* have repeatedly assailed it with columns of denunciation. It does not mortify me to discover that you know nothing of *The Independent*, but it is really humiliating to find that columns of personal abuse in journals that you would style "pro-slavery," have not sufficed to satisfy you of my orthodoxy upon that subject. Alas, that after having endured for three years the bitterest venom of the "pro-slavery" press, it should now hear the serpent hissing on the other side!

I have not sought occasion in England to utter my sentiments on the subject of American Slavery. I am here as a visitor for health and recreation, *in transitu* for the Orient, and have no desire either to speak or to preach, so that it matters nothing whether pulpits are open or closed. Yet I would gratefully acknowledge the courteous and cordial welcome which has everywhere been accorded me as a Congregational minister from the United States by the "Independent" ministers and churches of Great Britain. Such interchange of Christian fellowship is not only grateful to the feelings of a stranger, but has an important moral influence upon two kindred nations. It was in acknowledgment of this courtesy that I consented to speak at Bradford. The drift of my speech was to show that the system of Slavery, as it exists in the United States, admits of no justification; that the Fugitive Slave Law is an utter abomination, which no Christian or humane man could countenance by any manner of active obedience; and that the slave himself, as Lord Aberdeen has decided, may get his liberty by any means within his power; that while Slavery in the United States cannot be abolished by national legislation, it must surely fall before moral influences, and by the laws of political economy, especially when England shall cease to buy that *cotton* "which is the price of blood;" and that there is in the Northern States, and especially in the Congregational churches of America, a strong, healthful, decided sentiment against Slavery, much of which acts independently of any Anti-Slavery society. It was to illustrate this, and not for any personal reason, that I alluded to the rise of *The Independent* as simply a Congregational journal, which, however, spontaneously entered into conflict with Slavery, and in spite of a most unscrupulous and dishonourable opposition aimed against its editors and proprietors in other relations, maintained its ground, and by its decided Anti-Slavery tone drew to itself an unparalled accession of subscribers. It is most desirable that the friends of the Anti-Slavery Cause in Great Britain, should begin to understand the real strength of that Cause in the United States; and it was the one aim of my ten minutes' speech to assure them by facts of that strength. You complain that in a brief off-hand speech, I "had not a word to say in condemnation of the American slaveholding and slavery-abetting churches." If, as has been already proposed, an opportunity should be furnished me in London for a detailed statement of Anti-Slavery movements in the United States, what I might say with preparation for such an occasion, would afford a more generous play for your criticism.

When I speak at all in England on the subject of American Slavery, it must be just as I am accustomed to speak upon that subject at home, with this exception, that in a country where I have found men intelligent upon other subjects, who needed to be informed that Mr. Webster is not the President of the United States, that Slavery does not exist in New York, that *Uncle Tom's Cabin* does not portray American society in general, and that the "Church of *England*" does not exist in America at all—much less the dominant church—in a country where I have found such deplorable ignorance of my own country, its constitution, its government and its institutions; I think I can do more good—even for the cause of Anti-Slavery—by giving such information as will lead to proper discrimination both in speech and in action upon the subject of Slavery, than by tickling the ears of Britons with wholesale invective against American Slavery. I can use denunciation to better advantage where the subject is better understood. The opponents of Slavery in the United States rejoice that the moral strength of Great Britain is upon their side; but in order that that strength may be wielded effectually it must be wielded wisely. Kindness and discrimination, accompanied with decision, are far more weighty than turgid and vehement rhetoric. In this spirit I endeavoured in my speech at Bradford to do justice to two American ministers, Rev. Drs. Spring and Parker, from whom I differ widely upon this question, but whose views were misapprehended by a preceding speaker.

In conclusion you will pardon me for saying that the question whether there are any slaveholders in my church, will be matter for much merriment upon the other side of the water; the ludicrousness of the idea will quite overpower that general politeness which begets commiseration for a stranger who commits a laughable blunder without knowing it. Though my church has no article in its creed against slaveholding or intemperance, it is morally impossible for a dram-seller or a trafficker in human flesh to gain admission to its communion; and should the church vote the admission of such a communicant, it would thereby declare the pulpit vacant. Yet it is most true that I do not belong to the technically "Abolitionist party"; and I never expect to belong to it, but prefer to think and speak and act upon this subject, through the pulpit and the press, as an independent Christian man.

I am, sir, respectfully yours,
JOSEPH P. THOMPSON.

P. S.—I send herewith copies of two published discourses, giving my uniform views of American Slavery. I also enclose stamps for a copy of the *Advertiser* in which this letter shall be published, to be addressed to No. 7 Northumberland Court, Charing Cross, London.

This letter, it will be observed, contains no threats of a law suit. It may call forth an honourable retraction; but let not the reader suppose that so grave a matter can be settled in "any such mode." The *Advertiser* is reputed to be rich, and ought to understand this letter as a *hint* for some substantial compromise in dollars and cents! If this hint is not taken, other means of redress remain. "The law is open and there are deputies."

Not only does the writer regard this paragraph as a "calumny" and utter his "indignant remonstrance against the injustice of this libel," but "his counsel has investigated the whole case, and has expressed a decided opinion that the paragraph referred to is clearly libellous" Yet he delays commencing suit because he cannot decide at what figure to lay his damages. Twenty thousand dollars seems quite too small a consideration; for when one feels necessitated to represent personal character by its equivalent in money he may be excused for counting rather large. Twenty thousand *pounds* will be the lowest consideration accepted in the present case.

Another cause of delay is the difficulty of procuring witnesses at this distance from home. He has thought of adducing the files of the *Journal of Commerce*, the *New York Herald* and the *New York Observer* in evidence of his "abolition" sentiments, but doubts whether the court would admit their testimony. It is matter of regret that such "able and influential" journals are either not known at all—or are *too well* known for a case requiring legal accuracy and strict veracity.

The readers of *The Independent* shall be advised of suit whenever it comes off, and meanwhile their sympathy is respectfully solicited in behalf of an abused and injured man, whose reputation and influence are in the utmost peril.—T.

[From The [London] Morning Advertiser of Nov. 3.]

TOWARDS the conclusion of our article on American Slavery on Thursday last, we briefly adverted to a speech made at the meeting of the Congregational Union, by the Rev. J. P. THOMPSON, of New York, and took occasion to remark that, though the address of the Rev. Gentleman wore somewhat of an Anti-Slavery aspect, we did not altogether like some portion of it. We added, that we should feel obliged should any of our correspondents furnish us with some definite information respecting the antecedents of the Rev. Gentleman.

Our passing reference to Mr. Thompson, whom we now know to be the Editor of the *New York Independent*, as well as a popular divine, has drawn forth a long and elaborate reply. We think the Rev. Gentleman might have been a little less lavish of his indignation, because we cannot see that there was anything in our reference to him which could justify the hard epithets which he chooses to employ. The purport of our remarks was, that we had suspicions as to how far he is a thorough-going opponent of Slavery; and we sought for information with the view of setting ourselves right on the subject. Mr. Thompson talks about the superior urbanity and sense of justice which characterize the American press—which, we must say, is indeed something new to us, and then goes on to insinuate, if not in so many words to affirm, that not only the English press in general, but this journal in particular, is deficient both in courtesy and justice. The promptitude with which we insert the Rev Gentleman's reply, long and in some parts vituperative though it be, is, we trust, a sufficient answer to the charge which he is pleased to prefer against us. So far from waxing wroth at being suspected of entertaining undecided views on the question of American Slavery, and of pursuing or recommending a compromising policy, we should have supposed that Mr. Thompson would have been delighted at having the opportunity afforded him by our columns, of convincing the people of England, that he was thoroughly sound on that momentous question. The event has shown that we were mistaken.

But now let us come to close quarters with the Rev. Gentleman. He wonders on what authority we could have made the assertion, that the part of the resolution which recognised the merits of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, was expunged on his recommendation. We will furnish him with the information. It was made on the authority of the *Patriot* newspaper, in the same number which contained the report of the Rev. Gentleman's speech. And that journal, being the organ of the Congregational Union before whom he delivered his address, we should have supposed that a better authority could not have been got

Mr. THOMPSON says that our article contained insinuations against his personal honour. This is a groundless charge against this journal. We merely said that we did not like certain things in his speech, and that we were not without suspicions that he might not be up to our mark on the subject of American Slavery. Surely there was no imputation on the personal honour of the Rev. Gentleman in that. Our past experience of Transatlantic divines coming over to this country, has compelled us, whether we will or no, to look with suspicion on all importations of Rev. Gentlemen from the other side of the water. There is not a man among them who does not come as the professed opponent of Slavery. Dr. Baird, for instance, whom we now know to have been, in effect, the actual agent of the slaveholders of America, could affect to be as vehement as any one in the denunciation of the abstract evil of Slavery. And Dr Dyer, too, at a much later date, could express his abhorrence of Slavery, though he came over here as a delegate from the Sunday School Union of America—a body, we regret to say, who are steeped to the ears in the guilt of Slavery.

Mr. THOMPSON, if we understand him rightly, appears to think it decisive of his Anti-Slavery principles and practices, that he should be received with open arms by the evangelical churches of England. The Rev. Gentleman could not have fallen into a greater error. Our quarrel, for years past, with the evangelical denominations—Independents, Baptists, Presbyterians, Wesleyan Methodists—has been that they have been in the habit of according a hearty welcome to all evangelical divines from the other side of the Atlantic, without ever taking the trouble to inquire what their views were on the question of Slavery. Does Mr. Thompson not know that the pro-slavery Dr. Baird was not only admitted to the evangelical pulpits of England, but that he was actually embraced as a Christian brother, by the Evangelical Alliance, in the face of the most audacious abuse of that body, because he thought they went rather too far in their condemnation of Slavery,—though, to our apprehension, they did not go half far enough? Can Mr. Thompson, moreover, be ignorant of the fact, that the pro-slavery Dr. Dyer was actually asked to speak in support of a resolution, in the presence of 4,000 persons in Exeter Hall, at the anniversary of the Sunday School Union? It was not until we tore the mask from off the faces of each of these American Doctors of Divinity, that they found it necessary to withdraw from the platforms and pulpits of England, and ingloriously to sneak out of the country altogether.

It may to Mr. Thompson's mind be some vindication of the course we have pursued in asking for information as to his antecedents, on the question of Slavery, when we assure him that the "suspicions" we expressed—for we did nothing more—were not confined to our own breasts. They were shared by others—by some of the most intelligent persons in this country, and by some, moreover, who have for many years taken a profound and unceasing interest in the subject of American Slavery. So far, therefore, from feeling angry with us, the Rev. Gentleman ought to feel that we have done him a service in affording him an opportunity of setting himself right with the English public. And here let us whisper a word in his ear. The very soreness he displays at being suspected of soundness on the question of American Slavery, almost compels us to come to the conclusion that our suspicions were not altogether groundless.

Mr. THOMPSON refers to the ignorance which he has found to exist in this country with regard to American matters. No doubt there is much ignorance in particular instances with regard to Transatlantic affairs, just as there is in the United States respecting the affairs of this country. He tells us that he has met with a person who supposes Mr. Webster to be the President of the United States. Very likely: we can tell him in return that not long since one of his countrymen potently believed that George the Third is the present sovereign of England.

But all this is beside the question. What we want is, to purge the churches of England, and through them the churches of America, from the foul stain of Slavery. And as we feel that the best way to accomplish our object is, to take care, so far as lies in our power, that the churches here shall not receive into their arms Transatlantic divines, implicated, either directly or indirectly, in the guilt of Slavery, we shall not cease to keep a watchful eye on these American Rev. Gentlemen who may think proper to visit our shores. Nor will we be deceived by mere protestations of their regarding Slavery with perfect abhorrence. We must know how they have acted in their own country, in reference to the "domestic institution."

We are unwilling to doubt the protestations of an earnest attachment to the Anti Slavery cause, with which Mr. Thompson's letter abounds; but candour compels us to say, that there are portions of it, just as there were portions of his speech at the meeting of the Congregational Union, which wear, in our eye, a very unpleasant aspect. We wish the following passage were at the bottom of the sea, or, rather, we wish it had never been penned: "The opponents of Slavery in the United States rejoice that the moral strength of Great Britain is upon their side; but in order that that strength may be wielded effectually, it must be wielded wisely. Kindness and discrimination, accompanied with decision, are far more weighty than turgid and vehement rhetoric. In this spirit I endeavoured, in my speech at Bradford, to do justice to two American ministers, the Rev. Drs. Spring and Parker, from whom I differ widely upon this question; but whose views were misapprehended by a preceeding speaker."

This is Dr. Baird over again. Mr. Thompson seems, in many respects, a duplicate of that Transatlantic Doctor of Divinity. Dr. Baird, all the time he was in England, preached up the doctrine of acting wisely, with discrimination, and with kindness; and was seized with a perfect paroxysm of holy horror, whenever any one ventured to denounce the slaveholders with the vehemence which became the occasion. The grand error of the friends of slave emancipation in England has been, that they have acted with an excess of kindness, conciliation, and forbearance, to the slaveholders in the United States, and to those churches which are implicated in the guilt of the horrible system. Where would you find a set of more conciliatory, forbearing, or kindly considerate gentleman, than the persons composing the Anti-Slavery Society of New Broad-street? And what has been the result? Have they, in their edifying exercise of these "Christian" qualities, made any favourable impression on the Transatlantic abettors of Slavery? None whatever. The very opposite effect has been produced. The owners of human beings in America, and the upholders of Slavery on the other side of the Atlantic, have only laughed in their sleeves at the leniency, and forbearance, and charity, of the so-called opponents of Slavery among our evangelical bodies in England.

With the owners of slaves, or the abettors of Slavery, we would hold no terms whatever. We regard them as the greatest criminals on the face of God's earth. There is no other sin in the whole catalogue of human guilt, which, in the attribute of enormity, can at all be compared to theirs; while of all "proprietors" of their fellow man, those persons professing evangelical Christianity are, in our apppehension, incomparably the most criminal. And as we would, if we could, imprint on the foreheads of these persons such a mark of their guilt, as that all virtuous men might shun their society, so would we have no Christian intercourse with any one, whether he be Dr. Baird or the Rev. Mr. Thompson, who could preach up kindness, courtesy, and discrimination, in dealing with transgressors of so deep a die.

REV. J P. THOMPSON'S SPEECH

BEFORE THE CONGREGATIONAL UNION OF ENGLAND.

LONDON, October 21, 1862.

The Rev. Mr. Thompson, of New York, on coming forward to second the resolution, was received with loud and repeated cheers. He said: I also believe that Slavery ought to be destroyed (hear, hear). I believe that it will be destroyed, and that speedily ("hear" and cheers)—for, as Chloe says, "the Lord 'lows dreadful things sometimes," yet the Lord reigns and sees those "dreadful things." The Lord in His wise providence, suffered the passing, in our Senate, of that infamous slave law, to hasten, as I believe, the downfall of Slavery, by bringing the mind of the North to realize what Slavery is—to see it, not in the distance, but on their own soil—to see the man who had been for years a member of a Christian Church claimed by his former master, and sentenced by the magistrate, for an extra fee, back into Slavery—to see him torn from the Church, from his family, and from his friends. These are facts which have been, and will continue to make themselves, felt by the men of the North, who begin to see that the whole system must come to an end (hear, hear) Yes, it must, for the Lord sees all these dreadful things (hear, hear). I rejoice in this resolution. I give it my hearty concurrence; it does not need my advocacy (hear, hear). Rather let me say, I thank you for it (hear, hear). We should be glad if you would not only send this resolution, but send a delegation with it (hear). Let the reverend brother go who moved its adoption, and make the speech to which we have just listened *verbatim* in my pulpit in the Broadway Tabernacle, and he shall receive there a response as warm as you have given him here. Just because this resolution is discriminating, while, at the same time, it is straightforward and uncompromising, I rejoice in it. You do not deal in vague abstractions, but look straight at the thing itself (hear). As to Abraham being a slaveholder, and all that sort of nonsense, it was happily observed by the Rev. Dr. Bacon, who was in Europe last year, and who is associated with myself in editing a journal which has done some service in this cause, that had Abraham been living in these days, we should put him into the penitentiary for bigamy (laughter, and loud cheers). I remember hearing of a minister who, on reading that chapter in the Hebrews which makes reference to the ancient worthies, Gideon, Samson, Barak, said, "rather rough-spun saints here, I must confess" (laughter). I am ashamed to say that the sentiments quoted here this morning, as having been uttered by ministers in the United States, are strictly true (hear, hear). Allow me, however, as a matter of justice, to say, that Dr. Parker has denied and repudiated the sentiment attributed to him, and that Mrs. Stowe had publicly retracted it in the new editions of her book (hear, hear). I do not think that he ever said that thing, though I apprehend he has said things sufficiently verging towards it (hear, hear). It will interest you to know that the threatened prosecution of Mrs. Stowe for libelling the character of Dr. Parker, has been abandoned. He laid the damages at £4,000, because he said the sentiment attributed to him would injure his ministerial influence to that amount. I have no doubt it is true; but does not this speak well for the Anti-Slavery spirit of the American people (cheers)?

But the other sentiment, I am sorry to say, was uttered by one of whom I would speak only as becomes me of a senior in years and office, and of whose ministerial usefulness I cannot but speak in terms of respect (hear, hear). You will find it in his published volumes "First Things," by the Rev. Gardiner Spring, D.D., New York. And yet that sentiment, as it lay in his mind, admits of some qualification. He looks upon the slaves as utterly unfit for freedom in their present condition, and believes that the immediate effect of their release would be turmoil and bloodshed, and, therefore, he says, he would not offer one prayer for their liberation, even if he knew that one prayer would effect it. I do not agree with him (loud cheers). His church is next to mine on the Broadway, New York. I had the honour of being quoted by him in that very sermon in which he denounced my sentiments; and I was not long in returning him the compliment (laughter). In that same sermon of Dr. Spring's will be found this statement: "A fugitive slave is a nuisance, and the fact of a slave running away from his master is *prima facie* evidence that he is a bad man." At that very time the Rev. Dr. Pennington—a beloved and honoured brother in Christ, and a D.D. also, and, like Dr. Spring, a member of Presbytery (cheers)—was here in England, and in fear of apprehension as a fugitive if he should return to America and to his congregation. I came out, therefore, in the columns of the *Independent*, and made Dr. Spring say to Dr. Pennington personally. "You are an intolerable nuisance, and the fact that you ran away from your master is *prima facie* evidence that you are a bad man" (cheers). And I went on in this way till I trust the thing was a nuisance (cheers). The *Independent* is a Congregational newspaper. It was started by several gentleman, who engaged to furnish all the money if the pastors of the Churches would be responsible for the editing of it. These gentlemen yielded the entire control to the pastors. Well, the paper went forward, and excited a good deal of attention; and when the Fugitive Slave Law was enacted, it came out fully and unequivocally (hear, hear). We said, this measure, is not such as to demand revolutionary action; for the sake of the public peace, therefore, avoid all mobs and public excitement in opposition to the execution of this law; but let it be distinctly understood, that you will never give to this law any active obedience whatever (hear, hear). Treat him as a man; treat him according to God's law; give him bread, give him shelter; and if the officer comes to demand the fugitive, tell him that your house is your castle, and to enter at his peril (loud cheers). The man is under your protection, take that ground and maintain it, whatever the consequence may be, in the spirit of your forefathers, the martyrs and Puritans (cheers). This is what we recommend, and I am glad to find that it meets with your approval (cheers).

Now, sir, for the consequences. The commercial papers of New York broke forth in a strain of violent invective against the *Independent*, dragging forth the names of the proprietors, and holding them up to public scorn and contempt as the enemies of the "constitution" of the glorious Union, and recommending that they should not be traded with (hear, hear). Great efforts were made by the pro-slavery party to carry this recommendation into practical effect (hear, hear). You must know that two of the proprietors of the *Independent* are partners in a great silk house. Well, what did they do under these circumstances? Why, they came to me and said: "Stand your ground (great cheering)—if every subscriber quits the paper, we will pay for its publication" ("hear, hear," and cheers). Then they issued a card, announcing that they were silk merchants, and had a large assortment of all sorts; but that they sold only silks and not principles (loud and long continued cheering). Another of the partners, who was at that time and is, now, residing in the city of Manchester, connected with a large commercial house, wrote to the other proprietors in New York: "If you think that this assault upon us be likely to injure your business, and that my connexion is likely to be injurious to you, then I am ready"—not to withdraw from the *Independent*, but—"to dissolve partnership" (loud cheers). I mention these facts as illustrating the spirit of a great number of Christian men in the United States (hear). I do not know of a Congregational Church that tolerates Slavery (hear, hear). The Presbyterian Church is territorial in its character, and some of them in the South do hold slaves; yet it is a difficult question to decide what is the duty of the Northern brethren—whether they should withdraw from all connexion with the body because of this circumstance. For example, the General Assembly held its annual session lately in the city of Washington, when the Rev. Albert Barnes stood up, and, with the meekness and wisdom, forbearance and gentleness, which in him are combined in a greater degree than in any man I know—bore his manly, unflinching testimony against the whole system of Slavery from beginning to end ("hear, hear," and cheers). Now, I question whether he did not effect more good by this course than by leaving the body altogether ("hear," and cheers).

One word about the work referred to in the latter part of the resolution. Mrs. Stowe is associated with myself and others in the conduct of the very newspaper to which I have referred, as well as her noble brother, the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher (hear, hear). That work of hers has had a wonderful influence in the United States. It has been read by all classes of the people. It has spread like leaven in the city of New York. A very few years ago, a free expression of Anti-Slavery sentiment was hardly safe in that city; and now Mrs. Stowe's book is read and admired by all classes. It is acted in the theatres also, and calls forth the liveliest manifestation of sympathy from the masses of the people. There is progress here (hear, hear). This work will go forward (cheers). And when Great Britain shall find some other field from which to gather crops of cotton to be wrought into her manufactures, and when flax cotton shall be more generally used as a substitute, then the commercial and economical influence will entirely overthrow the entire system (cheers). I will only say, in conclusion, that I do not profess to be a platform speaker, and I am under a moral obligation not to speak at all, for in consideration of the supposed state of my lungs, my people kindly gave me leave of absence for a year, furnished me with money for my visit to Europe, and taking care of my family in my absence (hear, hear). I must not, therefore, abuse myself; yet I could not refrain from uttering a word or two on this occasion (hear, hear). I came to invite a representative delegation from this Union to ours (hear, hear). That, of course, will be a matter for you to consider. We love the Congregational Union of England. Its name has long been familiar to us (hear, hear). The Congregational Library adorns my shelf, and not only that, but "Mammon," "The Great Teacher," Pre-Adamite Earth" (cheers). To be sure, we obtain them by an evasion of the copyright; but if you complain of that, we hope you will feel sufficient compensation in the possession of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" (laughter and cheers). Come over and see us. We will give you the warmest welcome, and if we have nothing better to offer, there shall be a dish of good Yankee cod-fish, warranted to have been caught three miles from the British shore (laughter and loud cheers).

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

*** *All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns should be addressed to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

††† *Donations to the Treasury of the* AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY *may be forwarded to* FRANCIS JACKSON, *Treasurer, at Boston; or to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1852.

Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Fair.

THIS Fair will be held in the Assembly Buildings, corner of Tenth and Chesnut streets, in the city of Philadelphia, on the 14th, 15th, 16th and 17th of December. It will be opened to visitors on Tuesday the 14th, at six o'clock, P. M. The public are invited to attend, and are assured that, in the collection offered for sale, they will find a great and beautiful variety of useful and ornamental articles, fully equivalent to the prices asked for them.

Books, pictures, toys, stationery; muslin, worsted and silk fabrics; and an unusual supply of choice articles from Paris, will be among the collection.

Great efforts have been made to render this Fair highly attractive; and the importance of the enterprise to which the profits are devoted, commend it to the attention of the public.

A CLERGYMAN ABROAD.

WE have sometimes alluded to the difficulties encountered by clerical American gentlemen travelling in Great Britain and Ireland, and are quite free to confess that we have much oftener felt for them a sort of commiseration; for strong as the love of justice is in the human heart, the sympathy for human suffering is, not unfrequently, the stronger feeling. The public opinion of England and America is very often, in matters of great moment, but the anticipated judgment of the posterity of each upon their own times, and the admirers of a great statesman who may have just died may read now the verdict of the future upon their idol, or the time-serving religious teacher of to-day may, by crossing the Ocean, be told to his face what posterity will think of him. If we recognise, however, the immutable decree of even-handed justice, we cannot help turning, in some cases, to the dock with a feeling of pity for the stricken criminal.

We publish, in another column, several articles in reference to the Rev. Mr. Thompson, of this city, who is now travelling abroad. He is one of those gentlemen to whom these preliminary remarks may apply, and for whom our feeling of commiseration may be indulged in almost without stint. It will be seen that the speech he made before the Congregational Union was, on the whole, a very good speech, evincing in him a strong Anti-Slavery feeling. We will not doubt that it was perfectly sincere; and we are quite sure that had it been made in this city, it would have brought upon him the severe condemnation of the pro-slavery party, for, though even made in London, it is not considered beneath the notice of the *Journal of Commerce*, whose function of overseership is by no means confined to the limits of this city. But then, on the other hand, the speech is not free from objection when viewed from the Anti-Slavery stand-point; and it is not at all strange that the *London Advertiser*, taking that position, and quite familiar with the history of Anti-Slavery in this country, should deem it a fair subject of criticism. We cannot, for instance, conceive of any circumstances which would justify an earnest Abolitionist in making any apology for the Rev. Dr. Parker, who has always been a bitter and uncompromising defender of the system of Slavery, and has never objected to being known as such till a turn in the current of public feeling prompted him to throw off, by a quibble upon the construction of a sentence, something of the odium which his unchristian and inhuman sentiments had fastened upon him; nor in imputing a good motive to the Rev. Dr. Spring in declaring that he would not pray for the liberation of the slaves, though he knew his prayer would be answered; or in apologizing, as Mr. Thompson might with as much propriety have done, for another sentiment of Dr. Spring, that the African is an accursed race, and held, by the immutable justice of the Almighty, in a condition of servitude. An English Abolitionist, free from the social ties and personal motives by which an American is influenced, may well question the correctness and sincerity of the Anti-Slavery zeal of that man, unheard of, before by him, who, with such apologies on his lips, addresses an English audience. The editor of the *Advertiser*, of course, cannot forget that American clergymen, and indeed almost all sorts of Americans, whatever they may be at home, are excellent Abolitionists when they land in England. It is not shackles only that fall on English ground, but whips as well. But there is always one unmistakable mark in this kind of Anti-Slavery; it straightway falls to apologizing, as soon as it opens its mouth, perhaps for Slavery and slaveholders, and certainly for Northern indifference or hostility to Anti-Slavery, and Northern activity in defence of slaveholding. One who identifies himself with the class, should not complain if he is called of it.

But in the Rev. Mr Thompson's case, the *Advertiser* relied somewhat upon negative evidence. It was very natural for the editor of that paper to wonder that he had never heard before of Mr. Thompson, if his relations were such as one would be led to suppose from his speech. We should like, said the *Advertiser*, to know something of the gentleman's antecedents. It was a very natural and proper wish; and, in the absence of the desired knowledge, it was quite as natural to suppose, considering the state of the Anti-Slavery question in this country, that a man whose Anti-Slavery antecedents were not well known, had never had any. We submit whether, under the circumstances, the *Advertiser* has been unjust to Mr. Thompson, or Mr. Thompson, presuming him to hold the opinions he now avows, has not hitherto been very unjust to himself.

Perhaps we, in such a case, may be supposed to be able to shed some light upon the subject. We are sorry to be obliged to acknowledge that we are in somewhat the same predicament with the *London Advertiser*. Like it, we see some things to regret and object to in Mr. Thompson's speech, and, like it, we are, in a measure, ignorant of *his* antecedents. We know, to be sure, that Mr. Thompson has been an associate editor of *The Independent*, and that *The Independent* is, to a degree, an Anti-Slavery paper. Mr. Henry Ward Beecher is also connected with that paper, but his Anti-Slavery reputation does not depend upon that connection; rather the reputation of the paper has been earned by Mr. Beecher's Anti-Slavery. We cannot, therefore, take it for granted that Mr. Thompson is an Abolitionist because he is connected with *The Independent*; and we presume that its proprietors would not thank us or him for establishing any such rule in regard to it. Then Mr. Thompson, we know, is the pastor of the Tabernacle Church, and the Tabernacle Church, he assures his audience, is Anti-Slavery. Perhaps so; we are not disposed to deny absolutely a thing about which we do not pretend to have much positive knowledge. But what is an Anti-Slavery Church? On this point there would doubtless be a difference of opinion between Mr. Thompson and ourselves. That of the Tabernacle is an independent congregation, and so may not, in its church organization, give fellowship to slaveholders. But if this makes it an Anti-Slavery Church, it is so merely by a happy accident, for Mr. Thompson asserts in his speech that to refuse fellowship to slaveholders is not, in his opinion, desirable. Here is at once the old question—is that a Christian Church that recognises sinners as Christians? Or perhaps the Church of the Tabernacle is held to be Anti-Slavery because its pastor sometimes applies the principles of Christianity to man-stealing, from its pulpit. Here again we must take Mr. Thompson's word for it that that is his habit, as we have never seen any of his sermons, and have never heard of their exciting any public commotion. But that would only prove the pastor to be, in a measure, Anti-Slavery, but is no evidence of the character of the people. Who are they? Are they Whigs and Democrats? Do they do nothing politically to support Slavery, Slave-trading, and Slave-catching? Do they do anything for the promulgation of Anti-Slavery principles? Are they known on 'Change and in social life as Abolitionists, as they are known to be Presbyterians? These are momentous questions, and requiring exact answers before any Church can be truly said to be Anti-Slavery; for if to hear an occasional discourse upon the subject entitles one to that appellation, then a large proportion of Northern Churches have long ago earned it. But that is not our definition of an Anti-Slavery Church.

Mr. Thompson claims for himself a very wide Anti-Slavery reputation in this country, and perhaps he is entitled to do so. But here again we are compelled to speak merely with hesitation. We shall not deny his assertion, for he should know better than we what he is, and what is said of him. For our own part, however, we can only say, we never before heard of him as a zealous and obnoxious Abolitionist, though our residence has been, for nearly nine years, almost within sight of the Tabernacle Church. We recall the fact that on one occasion, one man did tell us that Mr. Thompson sometimes preached upon the subject of Slavery, but we are quite unaware of any Anti-Slavery influence of his; we have never heard of his addressing any Anti-Slavery meeting; nor have we ever thought of him as identified with the Anti-Slavery people of any school. On the contrary, on the principle that those who are not for us are against us, we should, had we been asked—to use an Americanism—to *locate* Mr. Thompson, have looked for him in that large class who, though their impulses may be good, quietly stand aloof from a cause which could bring upon them nothing but odium. And we have one fact which is very much to the point. The American Anti-Slavery Society, it will be remembered, was mobbed, in the Tabernacle, two years and a half since, and has never been able to hold a meeting in this city since for want of a convenient place. Now it should be known that the Annual Meeting of the Society had for years been held in the Tabernacle; and so complete was the understanding that on a certain half-day of Anniversary week the building was ours by prescriptive right, that the agent always called a few days previous to say, *pro forma*, "shall we put you down as usual for Tuesday morning?" But when, in the Spring of 1851, a year after the mob, we—doubting how we might now be received—called upon the agent to say that we presumed we were, as heretofore, considered entitled to the use of the building, the reply was, that it was engaged for Tuesday morning, and indeed, the whole week. We remonstrated at this virtual breach of good faith, and pleaded our heretofore understood right, but the only reply was, 'it is engaged.' On further inquiry we learned that our half-day was assigned to another Society nearly a year before, thus showing that the proprietors were determined to keep us out of their building, and had made haste to put themselves in a position to be able to plead another engagement. So, of course, the American Society was banished from New York, for no other building would be opened to people who were thus shut out from that which they had so long occupied.

Now the Tabernacle Church, the Church which, Mr. Thompson says, is so ready to welcome the English Abolitionists, is the proprietor of the Tabernacle building. The act of its agent is its own act, and we may judge thereby of its Anti-Slavery character. But is Mr. Thompson responsible for this act? Everybody knows how potent the influence of a pastor is, in this country, over his people, and nobody can doubt that had Mr. Thompson stepped forward and said to the Committee of the Tabernacle Build-

DEFECTIVE ORIGINAL COPY

ing, 'Gentlemen, we must, as Christians, and Abolitionists, and honest men, secure to the American Anti-Slavery Society a hearing within these walls,' the Anniversary of the Society would still have been held in this city, the right of Free Speech would have been preserved, and one triumph the less been accorded to the spirit of Slavery. This is the only antecedent of Mr. Thompson of which we can speak with positive knowledge, and we submit whether it does not entirely justify the question of the editor of the *London Advertiser*. Mr. Thompson, perhaps, might plead in justification of his course on this occasion, that he did not choose to identify himself with the American A. S. Society not because of its Anti-Slavery character, but because of certain other peculiar notions of a small number of its members. It would be the worst plea he could make to a large proportion of English Abolitionists, who look upon that Society as the representative of the Anti-Slavery cause. But that the mobbing of the Society, and its exclusion from New York, are looked upon as a blow to the cause itself, we can have no better evidence than the fact that Mr. Henry Ward Beecher, not a member of the Society nor altogether in sympathy with its method of seeking Emancipation, two days after the mob at the Tabernacle, threw open his own church for a lecture from Wendell Phillips, and presided at the meeting.

We may add in conclusion that we are glad to see that, spiritually, Mr. Thompson's foreign tour has been of service to him. He may be considered as, at least, in a hopeful way; and when he returns to this country, we trust that the zeal which has inspired him in England may find other outlets than an occasional sermon in the Tabernacle, and that he will be as ready here as there to signalize himself by an earnest co-operation with those who are labouring for the downfall of American Slavery. And we cannot help offering him our commiseration, whether acceptable or not, that the want of Anti-Slavery antecedents here should have placed him in so unpleasant a predicament with the English brethren who are apt to suspect the genuineness of the American Abolitionism which is first made clearly manifest at a London meeting.

SELLING VOTES IN WILLIAMSBURG.—It is a melancholy fact, but one which we are compelled occasionally to acknowledge, that coloured people, when under strong temptation, are sometimes quite as bad as white folks. Whether this should be considered as an evidence that they are not *folks* at all, we shall not stop to consider, as our object now is merely to record a transaction in the late election in Williamsburg. If they are sometimes led into evil, by the treachery of one of their number, by the whites, they have, at least, the merit of intending to do right, and, unlike a large proportion of the whites of New York and its vicinity, are above selling their votes, and are indignant at having them sold for them. A morning paper contains the following report of a meeting, last week, at Williamsburg:

At the adjourned meeting of the coloured citizens of the City of Williamsburg, held on Friday evening, the 19th instant, in the New Hall in South Sixth street, the following Preamble and Resolutions were offered by Willis A. Hodges, and unanimously adopted:

Whereas, It is evident unto all men that no person had a right to pledge or sell the coloured votes of this city, to either of the great political parties at the late Presidential Election; and whereas, Henry Dias, one of our respectable citizens, and others, have publicly declared, in the presence of Dr. Ray, that he (Dr. Ray) attended a meeting of the Liberty Party (which Party the coloured people of this city have been identified with for the last twelve years), on Monday evening, November 1, and then and there received a large number of the Liberty Party tickets; and stated that he would meet the said party at the polls the next day, and that he would co-operate with them; and whereas, Jacob Fields, one of our respectable citizens, has publicly stated that he was the next day deceived by Dr. Ray, and persuaded to vote the Locofoco ticket, by being made to believe that it was the true Liberty ticket; and whereas, the said Dr. Ray has confessed that he did enter into a covenant, and agree with a certain man, for a certain consideration of money, that he, Dr. Ray, would use all his influence to get the coloured people to vote the Locofoco ticket; that the said man was a Locofoco candidate for Congress; and whereas, Dr. Ray has further declared that carriages were placed at his command by the Locofoco party, in which he did convey to the polls all coloured persons whom he could induce to vote, telling them that the ticket which he gave them was the true Liberty ticket; and whereas the said Dr. Ray did also declare that he did cause 250 votes to be cast for the Locofoco party, at the late election, and has asserted that he felt it his privilege to make a business of speculating with the coloured voters of this city; therefore

Resolved, That in the opinion of the meeting, the duct of Dr. Ray is highly reprehensible; and that we have neither confidence or respect for him, and we think him unworthy of the good opinion of the people of Williamsburg.

Resolved, That while we think we are called upon as freemen, who have to pay dearly for the privileges of the ballot box, to deprecate all such miserable ways and means for sending men to Washington, who dare not open their lips for the oppressed, we should not forget Dr. Ray, who thus inflicted on us so great a wrong.

Resolved, That the coloured voters of Williamsburg will support no man for any office of trust, unless he shows us the cockade of universal freedom; nothing short of the annihilation of American Slavery will satisfy us.

Resolved, That P. W. Ray is the darkest Ray that ever came over Williamsburg, but we hope the spirit of truth and justice will drive him to his own company.

WM. J. HODGES, Chairman.

H. A. BUXTON, Secretary.

THE EMPIRE POSTPONED IN SOUTH CAROLINA.—The Governor of South Carolina has sent in his Annual Message to the Legislature which he concludes, by "congratulating the State on the present political calm, refers to past Northern aggressions, acknowledges that nothing has been done by Congress this year to complain of, but believes that this cessation of hostile acts against our institutions will be of short duration, and however strong his conviction as to the propriety of attempting to stay the coming storm, by separate State action, and however he might deplore the decision of the people, God forbid that he should fan the expiring embers of party strife by recommending it. He hopes, however, that the Southern States, on the occurrence of further aggression, which will surely come, will rise in their majesty and strength, and, in conjunction with South Carolina, either force their rights to be respected in the Union, or take their place, as a Southern Confederacy, among the nations of the earth, recommending, in the meantime, the development of the resources of the State, and by that means giving it all the power and strength of which it is capable."

—What may be the effect of the result of the Lemmon case, in this city, upon the mind of his Excellency, we do not yet know; it may possibly dissipate this peaceful state of mind, and lead to an immediate *coup d'etat* whereby the Emperor will be proclaimed under the title of Quattlebum I.

The Governor also alludes, in his message, to the case of the British seaman Roberts, and the demand of the British Consul for his release. The synopsis of the Message, sent on by Telegraph, gives the following summary of his Excellency's remarks on this head:

The message also alludes to the proceedings of the British Consul, relative to the imprisonment of the coloured seaman, Reuben Roberts, a native of Nassau, who arrived in the ship Clyde, on the 19th of May, at Charleston, from Paracos. The sheriff detained him until the 26th of May, when the ship sailed. On the 9th of June, a writ in trespass for assault and false imprisonment, from the Federal Court, was served on the sheriff, laying the damage at $4,000. The Governor recommended the act of 1844, to prevent persons of colour entering the State, to be amended to meet any similar case that may arise. Had not the proceedings been instituted, the Governor would have recommended a modification of the law so as to require captains to confine coloured seamen to their vessels, and prevent them landing, under heavy penalties. But now, self-respect demands that we should not abate one jot or tittle of the law, which was enacted to protect us from the influence of ignorant incendiaries.

GOV. JOHNSON, of Virginia, has called the attention of the Legislature to the Lemmon case. He does not recommend any specific action, but awaits a certified copy of the proceedings, when he intends to make it the subject of a special communication.

AID FOR THE LATE SLAVES OF THE LEMMONS.

IN its appropriate place on the first page of this week's paper will be found the appeal of the *Journal of Commerce* in behalf of the Lemmons, and the responses thereto. The amount, as we stated, last week, exceeded $5,000, a result showing that the bringing of their slaves to this port was a most fortunate speculation for the Lemmons. They have received not only far more than the women and children would have brought in any of the Southern shambles, but they are saved the expense of the transportation of their human cattle from here to Texas—If they ever meant to go there, for there is a doubt now in the minds of some people whether they intended to go farther than this city, and that the plan was, at the outset, that the slaves should be arrested, freed by the laws of a free State, and that just such an appeal should be made, as has been made, to the "gizzard of Cotton," which, they hoped, would result precisely as it has. If such was the plan, it was a shrewd conception, and has been excellently managed. We hope that any of our 'Southern brethren' who may happen to have some families of Slaves on hand which, whether from age, or youth, or sex, happen to be a profitless sort of stock there, that they may be brought here to be set at liberty, and to be paid for by Cotton Committees. It is a good thing for the Slaves; and if Southern trade is so valuable, we are quite indifferent as to the price that may be paid for it.

As charity, however, is not so good an investment—at least in this world—as Cotton, it is not surprising that the appeal made by the *Tribune* in behalf of the Lemmon Slaves was not so readily responded to as that for the Lemmons. It is a melancholy fact that either the rich people are not good, or that the good people are not rich, for the thousands raised for the master dwindled almost to hundreds when aid was asked for the servants. Nevertheless, it is gratifying to know thhat the appeal was not altogether in vain; and it is proper to consider that all that is given to the slaves is a real charity, while the donations to the master, though they fill his pocket, go to Profit and Loss on the Merchants' Ledgers as so much in the way of trade. If it were compassion that in any way moved these last, they would have given as readily to one party as the other; for if the Slaves were unfortunate in being emancipated, they were so much the more entitled to compassion; and if they were not unfortunate, all charitably disposed persons would be anxious to lend them a helping hand in new and untried circumstances. But all the Lemmon-aiders were waited upon and asked, for sweet Charity's sake, to give something to the poor women and children so brought among us; and from them all—see first page for a list of these Christians—there was raised the sum of precisely Two DOLLARS!

Of those, however, who did respond to the call in the *Tribune*, we give below a list as reported in that paper:

John Jaques	$3 00	X. Y. Z.	2 25
Hyde	1 00	S. N.	1 00
Jas. Patten	0 25	H. W.	1 00
E.	0 50	Jones	0 50
J. L. G.	1 00	A. C.	1 00
J. W. S.	0 25	T. S. H.	4 00
Freedom	1 00	Cash	1 00
Friend	0 25	J. W. H.	5 00
G. P. P.	3 00	Jacot, Courvoisier	
J. W. L.	1 00	& Co.	3 00
Full-Blood'd Yankee	10 00	W. R. Powell	1 00
Cash	1 00	W. H. B.	1 00
F. B. C.	1 00	C. H.	1 00
H. & T. S. Root	1 00	Robert Browne	10 00
J. T. Sanger	5 00	C. E.	10 00
S. S.	1 00	C. B. D.	10 00
Cash	3 00	Two Poor Men	10 00
J. A. Dwight	10 00	J. F. Sauzay	5 00
G. R. R.	10 00	J. S. S.	1 00
Mrs. Trimble	5 00	G. G. S.	1 00
J. A. C. G.	20 00	P. O'D.	1 00
G. B.	10 00	Lemuel Smith	10 00
Cash	2 00	J. L.	10 00
R. J. Dodge	2 00	Horace Greeley	20 00
H. Fuller	3 00	D. M. G.	1 00
W. J. B.	0 25	E.	1 00
F. H.	1 00	K.	0 50
Cash	2 00	Cash	0 25
H. C. S.	1 00	L. Wardell	1 00
S. W.	0 50	S. Cooper	0 25
Cash	2 00	J. W. B.	0 25
Bob	1 00	Post	1 00
Cash	2 00	J. C. D.	1 00
Cash	1 00	Richland	0 50
A Subscriber	5 00	Sarah	1 00
C. A. D.	1 00	A Barnburner	0 50
E. S. P.	1 00	Friend	1 00
J. L. W.	10 00	D. Kilgour, Jr.	10 00
Dexter Fairbank	10 00	R. Glenn	2 00
Tappen Townsend	5 00	T. L.	2 00
Wm. J. Young	5 00	J. C.	2 00
Cash	5 00	G. F. C.	1 00
Cash	1 00	J. L. L.	5 00
John Weller	10 00	F. H.	5 00
Lemons	5 00	That's all	5 00
R. Walker	1 00	A. P.	10 00
H. Munro	0 50	A New Yorker	2 00
E. C.	15 00	Cash	0 50
J. & G.	10 00	R. H., Philadelp'a	5 00
J. D.	2 00	Philadelphia	5 00
Isaac H. Bailey	5 00	Friends of destitute	5 00
S. F.	1 00	J. S. Jocelyn	1 00
L. & J. & W. B.	3 00	W. P.	3 00
H. Scott & Co.	10 00	P. G.	1 00
S. Lazarus	3 00	C. A. Avery	5 00
James Boardman	1 00	W. & C.	5 00
A. Thompson	1 00	J. W. F.	1 00
Wm. Langstaff	1 00	A Poor Cockney	0 50
J. J. Brown	2 00	H. F.	1 00
A. Deslen	2 50	Dr. Trall's Institute	5 00
Cash	1 00	Cash	3 00
Cash	1 00	J. F. C.	1 00
P. Ernst	1 00	Cash	2 50
Cash	1 00	R. J.	2 00
W. G. D.	1 00	A Friend to the	
James Barnett	5 00	Unfortunate	5 00
A. McL.	1 00	Thank Offering	1 00
W. B. T.	1 50	G. B. H.	1 00
Cash	1 00	——, Norwich	1 00
H. F. Clark	5 00	S. N. Reed, Suffield	4 00
Anti Lick-Spittle	5 00	G. W. Reynolds	1 00
George Scofield	3 00	S. W. & O.	15 00
J. P. Elwell	5 00	A. O. P.	2 00
Cash	5 00	Three Friends	15 00
Chas. Henry, Bos.	1 00	Kelso, N. Y.	5 00
H. Edgar Kelley	1 00	C. Whittemore	5 00
Anti Lemmon Aider	3 00		
Thurlow Weed	10 00	Total	$544 00
C. P. Williams	3 00		

COLLECTED BY HENRY C. BOWEN.

John Jay	$25 00	Cash	$5 00
A Friend, by J. Jay	25 00	J. E. Williams	5 00
Bowen & McNamee	25 00	James McCall	5 00
John Rankin	20 00	Cash (M.)	5 00
Benedict, Hall & Co.	10 00	Wilson G. Hunt	5 00
Freeland Stuart&Co.	10 00	William W. Stone	5 00
Dan'l Burgess & Co.	10 00	William H. Mellen	5 00
S. B. Collins	10 00	Hiram Barney	5 00
Wm. A. Hall	10 00	J. H. Ransom	5 00
Wheelock & Walker	10 00	George Bliss	5 00
R. W. Ropes	10 00	Doct. Thos. Ritter	5 00
Horace B. Claflin	10 00	Cornelius Smith	3 00
J. Howard & Son	10 00	Joseph H. Ladd	1 00
A. Robertson Walsh	10 00		
Rev. J. S. Storrs, Jr.	10 00	Total	$294 00
Cash (C)	10 00	Received at Trib'e	
Lewis Tappan	10 00	Office	544 00
A. B. Hull	5 00		
B. B. Sherman	5 00	Total to Saturday	$838 00

Of this sum, John Jay, E. D. Culver, and Lewis Tappan, are the Trustees, and will be glad to receive any further Donations.

PROPOSED ADDRESS FROM THE WOMEN OF ENGLAND ON AMERICAN SLAVERY.—A late number of the *London Times* contains a letter from the Earl of Shaftesbury, which he accompanied with an address, and a proposition that it be signed by his countrywomen and forwarded to their American sisters. The letter and address are as follows:

May I request you to insert in your paper this letter, and the copy of the proposed address which accompanies it?

It is with very great reluctance that I put myself forward, and venture to suggest a course of proceeding to my fair fellow-subjects, but I am impelled to do so by a feeling almost irresistible; a feeling in which they and many others will, I am sure, participate.

In the days in which we live more is to be permanently effected by public opinion, and by appeals to the great sympathies of mankind, than by force or by statute laws. If this, or some such address, were undertaken by local committees, enriched by many signatures, and then transmitted to America, it would not fail, under God's blessing, to produce a deep and fruitful impression.

The Affectionate and Christian Address of many Thousands of the Women of England to their Sisters the Women of the United States of America:

A common origin, a common faith, and, we sincerely believe, a common cause, urge us at the present moment to address you on the subject of that system of Negro Slavery which still prevails so extensively, and with such frightful results, in many of the vast regions of the Western World.

We will not dwell on the ordinary topics—on the progress of civilisation, on the advance of freedom everywhere, on the rights and requirements of the nineteenth century—but we appeal to you very seriously to reflect, and to ask counsel of God, how far such a state of things is in accordance with His holy word, the inalienable rights of immortal souls, and the pure and merciful spirit of Christian religion.

We do not shut our eyes to the difficulties, nay, the dangers, that would beset the immediate abolition of that long-established system; we see and admit the necessity of preparation for so great an event; but, in speaking of indispensable preliminaries, we cannot be silent on that law of your country which, in direct contravention of God's own law, "instituted in the time of man's innocency," denies to the slave the sanctity of marriage with all its joys, rights, and obligations; which separates, at the will of the master, the wife from the husband and the children from the parents. Nor can we be silent on that awful system which, either by statute or by custom, interdicts to any race of men, or any portion of the human family, education in the truth of the gospel and the ordinances of Christianity.

A remedy applied to these two evils alone would commence the amelioration of their sad condition. We appeal, then, to you, as sisters, as wives, and as mothers, to raise your voices to your fellow-citizens, and your prayers to God, for the removal of this affliction from the Christian world. We do not say these things in a spirit of self-complacency, as though our nation were free from the guilt it perceives in others. We acknowledge with grief and shame our heavy share in this great sin. We acknowledge that our forefathers introduced, nay, compelled the adoption of Slavery in those mighty colonies. We humbly confess it before Almighty God; and it is because we so deeply feel, and so unfeignedly avow, our own complicity, that we now venture to implore your aid to wipe away our common guilt and our common dishonour.

CUBA.—We want room for any comment upon, or other than this brief notice of the diplomatic correspondence which has been published, within the week, in relation to Cuba. It is not altogether a new development of the pro-slavery character of the Government of the United States, but it is a clearer proof of it, in this particular direction, than has hitherto been manifested.

Domestic Correspondence.

FROM OUR BOSTON CORRESPONDENT.

NO. CXV.

THE ARGUMENT.—*Coalitions Old and New—National Democracy defined—Also Patriotism—Fun lost, past and possible—Webster—Whig preferences for Senator—Scott-Whig ditto—The Dead-lock—Coalition prospects—The Funeral in Effigy—The Eulogy—It goeth a-begging—Its Manifest Destiny—Whig Riches and Poverty—Obituary Hillard—The Sims Brigade—The Correspondent standeth up for them—Their Negotiation for the Holy Coat—Its Success—The True Heroes—Not those of Brandywine—The Whittles—The Minstrel—The Whip—Chains again adorn Justice—The Correspondent abuseth the Newspapers and praiseth himself—He congratulateth the Editor on the Funniness of the World—And on Modern Discoveries—He commenteth on Yankee Comments on English Texts—The Editor of the Transcript settleth the question—Webster, Burke, Virgil, Dr. Trapp, Leonidas, the Harpies, Homer, Milton, Joel Barlow, &c., &c., &c.*

BOSTON, Nov. 29th, 1852.

IT is no news to you, by this time, that the Coalition has lost the State. A new Coalition of the Whigs and Slavery Democrats, with a slight dash of *Rum* in it, reigns in its stead. *This* Coalition, I suppose, is not "odious" and "abominable," as the other was. On the contrary, it is patriotic and conservative. The "National" Democrats—that is to say, those that think the crib at Washington better foddered than the Manger at Boston—brought about this Revolution by running split tickets in some towns and uniting with the Whigs in others, according as the exigency of each particular case required. Almost all the Free Soilers are fanatical temperance men and went in blindly for the Maine Law, while the Temperance Whigs, many of them, united with the Democrats in choosing men pledged against a measure they profess to regard as vital to their cause, that so they might secure a party triumph. The Maine Law was the chief element in this defeat, though the Presidential election entered largely into it. There is nothing that stimulates so strongly the fervours of patriotism (which is, being interpreted, the love of owning and catching negroes) as the near prospect of a new division of the public plunder. It would have been very good fun to see the wry faces Governor Mann's Inauguration would have caused in State street; the same in quality, but O, how inferior in degree! with that of the delicious Twenty-First of June—but, still, there is sport toward and the whole session must be much more amusing (the Whigs having but from five to ten clear majority) than if the Coalition had carried the day.

The chief business of this Legislature, besides repealing the Maine Law, being the choice of a U. S. Senator in Honest John Davis' place (so called, according to Prince John, to distinguish him from some other John Davis that is *not Honest*), the Whigs will find themselves almost as much at daggers'-drawing as the Free Soilers and Democrats would have done had the Coalition succeeded. The Webster men, chiefly from Boston, will hold the balance, and they would as soon choose Horace Mann or Charles F. Adams (they would much sooner choose the Devil!) as Robert C. Winthrop or John Davis, or any other man who can espy any flaw in the pure and perfect chrysolite of their idol. The Scott-Whigs, on the other hand, will hardly stultify themselves by voting for any partisan of the treacherous Whig who attempted, even from his coffin, to blast the party to which he owed everything. So they will afford a very pretty specimen of what Puff, in the Critic, calls "a Dead Lock," where neither party can move without destruction. They will, probably, have to compromise on some perfectly insignificant person, who, having sat on the fence all his life should be rewarded by being ridden on a rail, but who may jump off the fence into the Senate Chamber. If not, the Election must go over to the next Legislature, a consummation most devoutly to be deprecated, as it would give fresh life to the struggle of the Coalition for the recovery of its ascendancy, next Autumn. A struggle not unlikely to succeed, as the Democrats must have quarreled by that time, and the Free Soilers may have learnt not to burn their fingers with the Maine Law.

We are full of business to-day getting ready to bury Mr. Webster in Effigy, to-morrow. The day's papers will tell you of the procession that will "drag its slow length along" through the streets, and also of the profound grief that will fill every heart, and which you cannot refuse to believe on such authority. The Eulogy is to be delivered in Faneuil Hall, which will mourn as much as unlimited black cloth can make it. You know that Mr. Everett was first appointed to this task. But his succession to the Secretaryship of State rendering this impracticable, it was offered to Mr. Choate, and refused by him, as the ill-natured world believes, because it was not given to him at first; as, indeed, it should have been. This was more than a thousand pities. It would have well repaid a trip from New York to have seen him tear his hair and spin like a tetotum or a dervise about the platform. He would have resembled "a Monkey in Convulsions" (with a small touch of hysterics) more than ever before. These two gentlemen being out of the way, the Eulogy necessarily fell to the lot of Mr. George S. Hillard, really the only other man of the necessary literary and rhetorical abilities, excepting, of course, Mr. Winthrop, who was entirely out of the question in this case, that the Free Soil Exodus of 1848 has left the unlucky Whig Party. It has plenty of money; its coats and hats are unexceptionable; but, with these three (or four) exceptions, its stupidity is perfectly frightful. Of course Mr. Hillard does not stand in a line with Mr. Everett or Mr. Choate; but he writes good English (only rather over-finished and redundant in quotation and allusion), and his delivery is generally liked. His style, too, is eminently suited to the mortuary vein of eloquence, having been exercised in behalf of several deceased friends with a felicity justly entitling him to the *nom de société* of Obituary Hillard.

There was some talk of dispensing with any military escort, by way of *slur* upon Military Candidatism; but the services of the Sims Brigade called too loudly for remembrance to be overlooked, to say nothing of the necessity of "swallow-tailed coats" and cocks'-tails to give variety and life to a procession of black coats. It would have been altogether too bad had this slight been put on those gallant fellows. They would have been justified in refusing to turn out and help another City Government in an another *amateur* Slave-hunt. I hope I shall not be violating confidence (especially as the whole affair will be over before this letter appears) if I tell you that they have applied to the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society for the Coat which Sims wore when he was taken by Marshal Tukey's orders, and which has adorned their Office ever since. We were rather reluctant to trust so characteristic a relic out of our keeping; but, on the whole, we thought it unfair to rob them of such a trophy of the only campaign they ever had, or are like to have. So we have let them have it, they binding themselves in the sum of ten thousand dollars (the bonds signed by John H. Pearson and secured by the hypothecation of the Brig Acorn) to return it in like bad condition, after the ceremony. It is their intention to have it borne on a lofty staff, as was the turban of the Prophet, instead of the Colours of the Brigade, with this appropriate motto—"KNOW, WHETHER THIS BE YOUR SON'S COAT, OR NO!" It will be a deeply interesting object, from its intimate connection with the Great Seventh of March Speech.

While you must sympathize with the just pride of these fine fellows when marching under this remembrancer of their glory, you cannot fail to rejoice to hear that justice is to be done to the heroes who really bore the heat and burden of the day. For you know that the only danger the Sims Brigade encountered was their exposure, for several successive nights, to incessant Brandy and Water. To be sure, as the Civic Fathers did supply them with *wine, too*, they might justly receive the further honorary addition of "the heroes of Brandywine!" But the Boston Police, under the command of Marshal Tukey, were the real heroes of that day, and it is right they should not be forgotten on this. The whole force, than on duty, armed with the very Whittles served out by the United States, with which they used to be put through their exercise at daybreak, are to be marched in hollow square, as they escorted Sims to the Acorn, with an Ethiopian Minstrel (who has most kindly volunteered his services) in the centre, to represent that abandoned Traitor, so as to give a lifelike air to the scene. Unless, indeed (for which earnest efforts are making), a real slave can be caught in season for the Celebration. The Managers on this occasion, without regard to expense, have sent to Savannah and procured the very Whip with which Sims received "the usual correction," in the Jail there, for his attempt to destroy this Glorious Union, and which will be conspicuous in the Procession. The Court House, too, is to be again dressed in chains, a delicate and proper compliment to the Compromise Measures and the Memory of their ablest advocate. It is not impossible that, for some reason or other, some of these particulars may be suppressed in the published accounts. So little are newspapers to be relied upon in these days! Fortunate, indeed, are you and Posterity in having a Correspondent who unites to unusual facilities of information the most scrupulous regard to accuracy, even in the minutest particulars!

We, certainly, have great reason to be thankful that our lot is cast in so very entertaining a part of this funniest of all possible worlds. Only think of living in times when the Duke of Wellington is discovered to have been a *Wit*, Mr. Webster *a Saint*, and that Dutch bastard, Louis Napoleon (who, everybody knows, has not a drop of Bonaparte blood in his veins), to be the *legitimate* heir of the Bonaparte dynasty! It is not one of the least diverting passages of this our life to read the indignation of the Webster presses at the intemperate (though, still, good naturedly exaggerated) characters of Mr. Webster in the English papers. Nothing short of eulogy that would set him above all English Orators, to say nothing of "all Greek and Roman fame," will content the maw of these cormorants. However, Mr. Velasco (or *Alasco*) Sargent, the editor of the little *Transcript*, has put that matter at rest. It seems this sagacious gentleman has, "for the last three years, been a pretty diligent student, for a specific purpose," of ancient and modern orators, and we have his word for it that Mr. Webster don't

"———— fall below
Demosthenes or Cicero!"

This, of course, settles the question. He also confirms the extravagant hyperbole of Mr. Everett (only to be accounted for by warm personal friendship), "when he classed him as the superior of BURKE"!!! Will not Milesian impudence and Gascon assurance yield henceforth the palm to Yankee brass? Superior to Burke! If he be, it must be as Glover's Leonidas was equal to Virgil.

"Equal to Virgil! It may be, perhaps;
But then, by Jo*e, 'tis *Dr. Trapp's*!"

It must be some *very* American edition of Burke, published by the Harpies and Brothers, with the best things left out, to which he is superior. I wonder whether this Minute Philosopher of the *Transcript* did not discover, in the course of his specific studies, that Homer and Milton must knock under to Joel Barlow!—D. Y.

LETTER FROM G. B. STEBBINS.

YPSILANTI, Mich., Nov. 23, 1852.

FRIEND GAY: I wrote to you last from among the hills of Alleghany County, New York, and now date from a thriving town, of some 3,000 inhabitants, on the Central Railroad, thirty miles from Detroit. I came to this State a month since; stopped first at Adrian—the place where J. W. Walker, of Ohio, two years since, held a series of meetings, long enough and strong enough to reach the popular breast, and waken a deep interest in Anti-Slavery. Now meetings are always well, often largely, attended there, and our cause is gaining character and influence. Adrian has a large business, mostly mercantile, with a growing manufacturing interest—no town of its size in the country, perhaps, can show more lively activity in its streets. My time for nearly four weeks was spent within ten miles of that place—holding meetings in school-houses, a church or two, and twice in meeting-houses of Orthodox Friends, who showed considerable liberality—acting as Friends of "the olden time" would have done under similar circumstances.

Last week, Tuesday and Wednesday, spoke in Tecumseh, to some forty or fifty persons only; it is a town where Anti-Slavery is not as yet deemed sufficiently respectable to engage the attention of the public. After a tedious process of *ice-breaking*, some earnest interest was manifested by a few, and solicitations made for a return, with promise of efforts to obtain a Church instead of paying for a Hall; so I shall, if possible, pay another visit there. Last Thursday, came to Ypsilanti by stage, and found the way, next morning, to the house of Samuel D. Moore, a Friend, formerly from Christiana, and three years ago an emigrant into a new farm in the timber land six miles southeast of the town. Some of the coloured men implicated in the famed trials for treason were formerly tenants of his, and an earnest interest in the slave leads him still to lend active aid and ready sympathy to the work of revolutionizing public opinion.

A notice of a few hours brought together, from a circuit of three miles, a house full of men and women, candid hearers, such as it is a pleasure to talk with.

The next evening I went to a large new school-house some miles distant, still farther in the partially cleared forest. A large part of Michigan, you may know, probably, is "oak-openings"—a light, sandy, and yet rich soil, covered in its natural state with groves of beautiful oaks, not standing densely together, but often so distant that a carriage can find its way among them. The "openings," easily cleared and tilled, are usually first settled, and in a few years assume the appearance of an old and richly cultivated country. For miles north one can pass through a region on which twenty years ago the foot of a white settler had scarcely trod now all cultivated, fenced with neat farm-houses here and there, good roads and the aspect of a civilization the growth of half a century.

South is a region of forests, not as densely settled, but now fast filling up, each "clearing" with its cabin or framed house, surrounded by towering trees, standing thick and tall, as they have stood for centuries. Amid such a "clearing" was the school-house and two cabins; as I sat by the window of the friend with whom the day was spent, looking out West, North and East, over a hundred acres of land, from which the patient, hard toil of the pioneers had removed every tree, and which gave evidence of having borne heavy crops of corn and wheat, the heavy forests, as yet untouched by the axe, shut out further scope of view, rising like a wall on every side.

On the "clearing," orchards and cultivated flowers, as well as grain; in the forest, all as nature left it. The wilderness and the rose in close proximity! Pass through a score of years hence, and the wilderness will be gone, the rose will be blooming where stand the tall monarchs of the woods. Happy homes, kind hearts and sweet affections, with no fear of the lash or fetter, no agony of despair lest a strong son or lovely daughter be sold to a life of toil, a slave far away. How Hope and Faith, born of Freedom, make the arm strong that levels the forest! But to return to the thread of our narrative, that house was filled, as was a Friends' Meeting-house, on Sunday. Last evening, I spoke in a Hall in the town to some sixty persons, and make another effort to-night. The Anti-Slavery feeling seems to have reached the country here far more than the towns; this is often the case everywhere, but peculiarly so in this State, so far as I know from observation.

I see you have mentioned, in the *Standard*, my being hurt in Phillipsville, New York. I did not speak of it in any letter to you, not caring to "glorify mine office" by heralding a martyrdom; but, as it is known, a word in justice to all.

Phillipsville, is a town on the Genesee river, in the lumbering region, in which Anti-Slavery has been but little discussed. I was invited to go there, and felt the more inclined to do so, from the fact, that Rev. W. Van Antwerp had just settled there, a man of much liberality and feeling, although connected with the Presbyterian church. On applying for the church (Presbyterian) in which he preached, the trustees (Democrats) at once refused, or rather a majority of them did.

The Methodist house was readily had, and a small audience came together, through storm and darkness, and gave attentive hearing, making a few candid inquiries.

The next day there was a good deal of discussion about town, and some men, claiming to be respectable, said I should be turned out of town, sentiments which met little response and more rebuke, but stirred up some poor ignorant men to mischief. The next meeting, three days after, was well attended, and all was perfectly quiet until two eggs were thrown, one hitting the wall and another me, directly in the eye. The sharpshooter made his escape at once, but was identified; much indignation was expressed. The leading trustees of the church, and other friends, stood ready to do all possible to bring the offenders to justice legally.

That I did not come to do, and left the matter, trusting that it would create a feeling in favour of free speech, and our cause. Nothing but the severity of my hurt prevented me from holding other meetings, which would have been well attended, as the tide was turning right.

Mr. Van Antwerp took me to his house, and, through a night of sleepless suffering, showed the kindness of a brother.

The egg, by the way, may be said to have been compounded as follows, viz: about three fifths Democracy (the *real Hunker article*), two-fifths Whiggery (*pure Silver-Gray*), with a *spice* of Presbyterianism (*a la Dr. Spring*), as a chastisement for my presumption in seeking to free the descendants of Ham against the Divine Will. But this letter is long enough. Your readers will not, like Oliver Twist, ask for more unless I leave off. So Farewell until my postscript in the morning.

Yours Truly, G. B. STEBBINS.

P. S. Wednesday, Nov. 24th, 2 o'clock P. M. Spoke again in the Hall last evening, with about a hundred persons present, an audience better in quality, morally and intellectually, than the first. I am just about leaving for Plymomth, a town some twelve miles distant, with an intelligent and liberal population. G. B. S.

A COMICAL PARSON.

"REV. H. N. HUDSON delivered the New England Lecture in Brooklyn last night. Jovial Jack Falstaff was his subject, and he handled the monstrous knight much to the edification and amusement of his large audience."—*N. Y. Tribune.*

The *Tribune* of the next day contains a report of the Parson's lecture, and, while we find in it much amusement, we have in vain looked for the "edification" said to have been furnished to the eager audience. Not one religious sentiment, not one moral reflection seems to have escaped the lips of this professed preacher of righteousness. Not a sentence can be found in the report of the lecture that might not have been consistently uttered by an infidel, or even by an Atheist. The following extract gives a just idea of the character of the lecture delivered to a "large audience" by this man of God: "The animal susceptibilities of our nature are in him (Falstaff) carried to their highest pitch. His several appetites hug their respective objects with exquisite gust. His vast plumpness is all mellow with physical delight and satisfaction, and he converts it all into thought and mirth. Moreover, his speech borrows additional flavour and effect from the thick foldings of flesh, and cherishes it as being the procreant cradle of jests; if his body is fat, it enables his tongue to drop fatness; and in the chambers of his brain all the pleasurable agitations that pervade the structure below are curiously wrought into mental delectation. With how keen and inexhaustible a relish does he pour down sack! as if he tasted it all over, and through his body, to the ends of his fingers and toes!" (applause)

What a happy man, according to our Divine, was this lewd beastly drunkard!

The Protestant Episcopal Church has, we understand, the honour of numbering this travelling lecturer on Shakspeare among its ministers. Unhappily, there is in churches, as well as in individuals, often a vast difference between profession and principle, theory and practice. The Episcopal Church sets forth a high standard of ministerial fidelity and zeal. Her ministers are professedly to spend and be spent in the labours of their sacred function. The Bishop, when about to ordain the candidates for holy orders, thus solemnly admonishes them: "We exhort you, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye have in remembrance into how high a dignity and to how weighty an office and charge ye are called; that is to say, to be messengers, watchmen and stewards of the Lord; to teach, to premonish, to feed and provide for the Lord's family, and to seek for Christ's sheep who are dispersed abroad, and for his children who are in this naughty world, that they may be saved through Jesus Christ forever. See that ye never *cease your labour, your care and diligence*, until ye have done all that lieth in you according to your bounden duty to bring all such as are or shall be committed to your charge, unto that agreement of the faith and knowledge of God, and to that ripeness of age in Christ, that there shall be no place left among you either for error in religion, or for viciousness in life. Consider how studious ye ought to be in reading and learning the Scriptures, and in framing the manners both of yourselves and of them that specially pertain unto you according to the rule of the same Scriptures, and for this self-same cause how ye ought to forsake and set aside as much as ye may all worldly cares and *studies*." Among the vows required from the candidate is, that he will lay "aside the study of the world and the flesh." But this vow, and these requirements of the Bishop, do not, it seems, in Mr Hudson's opinion, require him to lay aside the study of the fat Knight and Dame Quickly, nor from running to and fro, and for a pecuniary consideration enlightening all who will come unto him as to the real characteristics of these two worthies.

In short, it is a terrible scandal to religion, a great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, and a grievous and almost irremediable wound to the clerical profession, when its members thus trample in the mire the decencies belonging to it, and, instead of fulfilling their mission by impressing on their hearers the awful realities of death, judgment and eternity, try to turn a penny by *amusing* large audiences, and, as if more effectually to amuse them, carefully avoid making the slightest reference to a future life and a future retribution. We know not who is the Bishop that claims ecclesiastical authority over the comical Parson, but we think he would consult the interests of the Church by hinting to the lecturer that his services as a labourer in the Gospel vineyard can be dispensed with.

Many of the clergy are making great complaints of the increase of infidelity. It would not be amiss were they to inquire how far *their own conduct* proves to multitudes a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence. O.

FRANKLIN PIERCE is the youngest man who has ever been elected President of the United States. He is 48 years of age. Washington, John Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, John Quincy Adams, and Van Buren were each 58; Jackson, 62; Harrison, 68; Taylor, 66; and Polk, 49.

WOMAN'S RIGHTS CONVENTION.—The recent Convention at Mount Gilead was numerously attended, the church being filled during the sessions. There was quite a sprinkling of Quakers present, and the resolutions reported the second day produced considerable discussion, and was finally adopted. Mrs. T. C. Severance, of this city, read an address which was listened to with marked attention. Mr. A. L. Hine and Professor Stockwell, of Cincinnati, also addressed crowded houses.—*Cleveland Herald.*

THE three following paragraphs are from *The Richmond* (Va.) *Republican*.

MISS-FORTUNE.—Sarah Fortune, a free negress was ordered thirty-nine lashes and held to bail for impudence to Mrs. Fitzgerald, but before the hour of punishment arrived, she had several severe fits in the court-room. Cause—too much mean whiskey.

ACCIDENT.—Frances Thomas, a Powhatan free negress, ordered to jail for not having city papers, made her escape by officer Page not understanding the order of the Court.

WELL DOSED.—The free negro, Nokiah Lisander, that made fight with officer Tyler on Monday last, when about to arrest him, was brought before the Mayor yesterday morning, and ordered thirty-nine lashes for remaining in the Commonwealth contrary to law. The Mayor directed the officers of police to bring this fellow in and have him dosed every day until he left the State. Lisander is, we believe, originally from New Jersey, and has been frequently ordered to return to his native State, but rather than do so, he hangs on to the good old Commonwealth, occasionally undergoing a severe castigation for thus violating the law. Pity that he could not be disposed of to a good master and thereby be rendered happy.

DEATH OF YOUNG CARNEAL.—The telegraph, several days since, with its usual errors in names, gave us the incident of the killing of young Thomas Carneal, formerly of this city, and son-in-law of Governor Foote, of Mississippi. The following, from the Vicksburg *Whig*, of the 11th inst., gives a true account of the unfortunate affair: "We learn that an affray occurred a few days since, on the steamer C. E. Watkins, while lying opposite the residence of Judge James, of Washington County, which resulted in the death of Thomas Carneal, Jr., and probably of Judge James also. A difficulty occurred between Mr. Carneal and the Judge, which resulted in the stabbing of the Judge, so that his life is despaired of; and a son of the Judge, who came up shortly after the occurrence, being greatly exasperated on learning that his father's wounds would probably be fatal, deliberately shot Carneal dead—firing two barrels loaded with buckshot—several balls entering the head, and the region of the body around the heart. The Judge of the Circuit Court issued a warrant for young James, and we learn that he sent word to the Sheriff that he would give himself up, and a deputy was commissioned to take him. We learn, also, that Mr. Carneal, in his passion, cut Mr. Yerger, the Sheriff, and Mr. Robards, the Justice, while they were endeavouring to keep him from using the knife on Judge James."

THE *Richmond Dispatch* has the following: Amos Lee, the negro slave who attacked his overseer, Mr. George W. Euchron, in Dr. J. Mosby's factory, on 11th-st., on the 12th of November last, when he was about to chastise him for disobedience, and was shot and struck by Mr. Fuchron in self-defence, died from the effects of the injuries he received, about 8 o'clock yesterday morning. An inquest was held at 12 M, in the Medical College, over the body of the negro, at which James W. Fuchron, a youth, deposed as follows:

G. W. Fuchron, my brother, on the 12th November, ordered Amos, who had been absent from work contrary to orders, to take off his shirt, and Amos said he would not do it, and did not intend to take a whipping; the negro then caught my brother by the throat, and my brother asked me to give him the monkey wrench, which I did; my brother then told the negro to let go his hold or he would hit him with it; Amos would not, and my brother hit him with the wrench; my brother was then nearly choked out of breath; Amos was knocked loose by the blow, the wrench falling out of my brother's hand; my brother then hit him with his fist and both fell, and in rising, hung again; I had my brother's revolver in the desk, locked up, and when they were knocking at each other, at the request of my brother I procured it and gave it to him; he then shot the negro who hung on until my brother shot him the third time, when he let go and run; my brother was overseer over the negroes in the room in which the difficulty occurred; one of the shots took effect in the right shoulder, another in the right hip, and another in the left leg of the negro; the negro had been out of the factory for a day and a half without the permission of my brother or myself, without our knowing anything about it; at the time my brother ordered him to take off his shirt my brother had nothing in his hand.

NINETEENTH

NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY BAZAAR.

THE National Anti-Slavery Bazaar will open on the morning of *Wednesday, December, 22*, at 10 o'clock, in *Horticultural Hall, School Street.*

While the Managers regret that circumstances have prevented their obtaining a larger Hall, they have much pleasure in calling the attention of their friends to the facts of its central situation and convenient access as important compensations.

The size and ornamental arrangements of the Hall, are such as to disperse with all necessity for decoration, a circumstance on which we would congratulate the friends who have so kindly assumed the responsibility of this great labour in past years.

We are also obliged to relinguish a Refreshment Room for the use of Ladies acting as Sales women, but the number of Omnibus Lines near the Hall will render this a matter of less inconvenience than would otherwise be the case.

A Refreshment Table in the Hall will be provided as in former years, and we would solicit the usual supplies from such friends as have heretofore assumed the charge of this department.

Tea, Coffee, Cake, Cream and Confectionary will be particularly acceptable.

Societies or Individuals who may prefer to make donations of money to the Bazaar in preference to manufactured articles are informed that it will be equally acceptable, and duly acknowledged in the Bazaar Gazette.

The articles offered for sale will be as varied and beautiful, as in any former year, and we trust that every Abolitionist who can conveniently do so will feel it a matter of conscientious obligation to aid the Bazaar, either by donation or purchase.

Let all friendly to the Abolition of American Slavery delay the purchase of their Christmas and New Years Gifts till the 22d of December, and they can gratify by the same act their affections and philanthropy alike.

The Liberty Bell will be published on the first morning o the Bazaar.

Industrial Association.

A MEETING of the friends of Social Reform will be held in this city, at Clinton Hall, on Wednesday evening, December 8th, at 7 o'clock, for the purpose of presenting a statement of the Plans and Objects of the RARITAN BAY UNION to the Public. It is expected that a delegation from the North American Phalanx and Hopedale Community will be present, and give an account of the progress and present condition of these Associations.

All interested are invited to attend.

Anti-Slavery Fair.

THE Seventeenth Annual Anti-Slavery Fair of Pennsylvania, will be held in the Assembly Buildings, on Tenth and Chestnut streets, on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, the 14th, 15th, 16th and 17th of December, 1852. The committee of Arrangements, on issuing their announcement, feel that very few words can be needed from them, to insure the active co-operation of the Abolitionists of Pennsylvania in this important department of Anti-Slavery labour. The claims of our Fair are so well understood, and have been, for many years, so cheerfully met by those on whom we rely for aid, that we feel assured that all that is necessary, on our part, is a request for co-operation. The work of preparation, in city and country, is efficiently begun, and needs only the active self-denying labour of former years to carry it to most successful completion. No efforts will be spared by the committee to make the Fair as attractive, elegant, and profitable as possible, and this they hope to do by the abundant contributions of friends in various parts of the country. Donations of all marketable commodities will be acceptable. We trust that none will fail to contribute, either of time, labour, money or its equivalent, according to his or her ability. Our cause demands our earnest, unwearied efforts for its promotion, and the indications of success which a retrospect of the past furnishes, should be to us so many incentives to renewed vigilance.

We commend our Fair to the patronage of its well-tried friends, not doubting that our appeal will meet a response worthy of the cause in whose behalf it is made.

MARY GREW, LUCRETIA MOTT,
ANNA M. HOPPER, EMILY W. TAYLOR,
SARAH PUGH, ABBY KIMBER,
MARIA M. DAVIS, MARTHA KIMBER,
EMMA PARKER, HARRIET D. PURVIS,
SARAH M. DOUGLASS, MARGARETTA FORTEN,
SARAH A. MCKIM, JENNETTE JACKSON,
REBECCA PLUMLY, MARY A. W. JOHNSON,
MARTHA W. CARMAN, HANNAH L. STICKNEY,
MARGARET JONES, MARY T. STICKNEY,
GULIELMA M. JONES, REBECCA S. HART,
ELIZABETH CARMAN, HULDAH JUSTICE,
MARY A. HALL, MARY SHAW,
ELIZABETH GAY, SUSAN W. SHAW,
EVELINA SUPPLEE, LYDIA WHITE,
SARAH L. CHILD, ELIZAB'H CLENDENNON,
ANNA M. CHILD, ELIZABETH J. LEWIS,
MARY M. JENNINGS, CLEMENTINE G. RUBY,
HANNAH STEELE, ANNE PARKER,
MARY TEESE, HESTER RECKLESS,
SARAH C. KENDERDINE, CYNTHIA COLLINS,
HANNAH HAYDOCK.

Miscellaneous Department.

MRS. STOWE AT LANE SEMINARY.

In a late number of *Fraser's* (London) *Magazine* is a lively and interesting sketch of the whole Beecher family, by one who calls himself 'An Alabama Man,' and who we presume to be a son of James G. Birney. We take from it some account of Mrs. Stowe's residence at Lane Seminary, and the memorable events which occurred there, and in Cincinnati in, and subsequent to, the memorable year of 1835.

The "peculiar institution" was destined to thwart the grand object in life of Mrs. Stowe's father and husband. When they relinquished their excellent positions in the East in order to build up the great Presbyterian Seminary for the Ohio and Mississippi valley, they did so with every prospect of success. Never did a literary institution start under finer auspices. The number and reputation of the professors had drawn together several hundred students from all parts of the United States; not sickly cellar plants of boys sent by wealthy parents, but hardy and intelligent young men, most of whom, fired by the ambition of converting the world to Christ, were winning their way, through privations and toil, to education and ministerial orders. They were the stuff out of which foreign missionaries and revival preachers are made. Some of them were known to the public as lecturers: Theodore D. Weld was an oratorical celebrity. For a year all went well. Lane Seminary was the pride and hope of the church. Alas for the hopes of Messrs. Beecher and Stowe! this prosperity was of short duration.

The French Revolution of 1830, the agitation in England for reform, and against colonial Slavery, the fine and imprisonment by American courts of justice, of citizens who had dared to attack the slave trade carried on under the federal flag, had begun to direct the attention of a few American philanthropists to the evils of Slavery. Some years before, a society had been formed for the purpose of colonising free blacks on the coast of Africa. It had been patronised by intelligent slaveholders, who feared the contact of free blacks with their human chattels; and by feeble or ignorant persons in the North, whose consciences impelled them to act on Slavery in some way, and whose prudence or ignorance of the question led them to accept the plan favoured by slaveholders. However useful to Africa the emigration to its shores of intelligent, moral, and enterprising blacks may be, it is now universally admitted that colonisation, as a means of extinguishing Slavery, is a drivelling absurdity. These were the views of the Abolition Convention, which met at Philadelphia in 1833, and set on foot the agitation which has since convulsed the Union.

The President of that Convention, Mr. Arthur Tappan, was one of the most liberal donors of Lane Seminary. He forwarded its address to the students; and a few weeks afterwards the whole subject was up for discussion amongst them. At first there was little interest. But soon the fire began to burn. Many of the students had travelled or taught school in the slave States: a goodly number were sons of slaveholders, and some were owners of slaves. They had seen Slavery, and had facts to relate, many of which made the blood run chill with horror. Those spread out on the pages of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, reader, and which your swelling heart and overflowing eyes would not let you read aloud, are cold in comparison. The discussion was soon ended, for all were of accord; but the meetings for the relation of facts were continued night after night and week after week. What was at first sensibility grew into enthusiasm; the feeble flame had become a conflagration. The slave owners among the students gave liberty to their slaves; the idea of going on foreign missions was scouted at, because there were heathen at home; some left their studies and collected the coloured population of Cincinnati into churches, and preached to them; others gathered the young men into evening schools and the children into day schools, and devoted themselves to teaching them; others organized benevolent societies for aiding them, and orphan asylums for the destitute and abandoned children; and others, again, left all to aid fugitive slaves on their way to Canada, or to lecture on the evils of Slavery. The fanaticism was sublime; every student felt himself a Peter the Hermit, and acted as if the Abolition of Slavery depended on his individual exertions.

At first, the discussion had been encouraged by the President and Professors; but when they saw it swallowing up everything like regular study, they thought it high time to stop. It was too late; the current was too strong to be arrested. The commercial interests of Cincinnati took the alarm—manufacturers feared the loss of their Southern trade. Public sentiment exacted the suppression of the discussion and excitement. Slaveholders came over from Kentucky and urged the mob on to violence. For several weeks there was imminent danger that Lane Seminary, and the houses of Dr. Beecher and Professor Stowe, would be burnt or pulled down by a drunken rabble. These must have been weeks of mortal anxiety for Harriet Beecher. The board of Trustees now interfered, and allayed the excitement of the mob by forbidding all further discussion of Slavery in the Seminary. To this the students responded by withdrawing *en masse*. Where hundreds had been, there was left a mere handful. Lane Seminary was deserted. For seventeen years after this, Dr. Beecher and Professor Stowe remained there, endeavouring in vain to revive its prosperity. In 1850 they returned to the Eastern States, the great project of their life defeated. After a short stay at Bowdoin College, Maine, Professor Stowe accepted an appointment to the Chair of Biblical Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Massachusetts an institution which stands, to say the least, as high as any in the United States.

These events caused a painful reaction in the feelings of the Beechers. Repulsed alike by the fanaticism they had witnessed among the foes, and the brutal violence among the friends of Slavery, they thought their time for action had not come, and gave no public expression of their abhorrence of Slavery. They waited for the storm to subside, and the angel of truth to mirror his form in tranquil waters. For a long time they resisted all attempts to make them bow the knee to Slavery, or to avow themselves Abolitionists. It is to this period Mrs. Stowe alludes, when she says, in the closing chapter of her book: "For many years of her life, the author avoided all reading upon or allusion to the subject of Slavery, considering it as too painful to be inquired into, and one which advancing light and civilization would live down." The terrible and dramatic scenes which occurred in Cincinnati, between 1835 and 1847, were calculated to increase the repugnance of a lady to mingling actively in the *melee*. That city was the chief battle ground of Freedom and Slavery. Every month there was some event to attract attention to the strife; either a press destroyed, or a house mobbed, or a free negro kidnapped, or a trial for freedom before the courts, or the confectionary of an English Abolitionist riddled, or a public discussion, or an escape of slaves, or an armed attack on the negro quarter, or a negro school-house razed to the ground, or a slave in prison and killing his wife and children to prevent their being sold to the South. The Abolition press, established there in 1835 by James G. Birney, whom, on account of his mildness and firmness, Miss Martineau called "the gentleman of the Abolition cause," and continued by Dr. Bailey, the moderate and able editor of the *National Era*, of Washington city, in which *Uncle Tom's Cabin* first appeared in weekly numbers, was destroyed five times. On one occasion, the mayor dismissed, at midnight, the rioters who also pulled down the houses of some coloured people, with the following pithy speech: "Well, boys, let's go home; we've done enough." One of these mobs deserves particular notice, as its victims enlisted deeply the sympathies of Mrs. Stowe. In 1840, the slave catchers, backed by the riff-raff of the population, and urged on by certain politicians and merchants, attacked the quarters in which the negroes reside. Some of the houses were battered down by cannon. For several days the city was abandoned to violence and crime. The negro quarters were pillaged and sacked; negroes who attempted to defend their property were killed, and their mutilated bodies cast into the streets; women were violated by ruffians, and some afterwards died of the injuries received; houses were burnt, and men, women, and children were abducted in the confusion, and hurried into Slavery. From the brow of the hill on which she lived, Mrs. Stowe could hear the cries of the victims, the shouts of the mob, and the reports of the guns and cannon, and could see the flames of the conflagration. To more than one of the trembling fugitives she gave shelter, and wept bitter tears with them. After the fury of the mob was spent, many of the coloured people gathered together the little left them of worldly goods, and started for Canada. Hundreds passed in front of Mrs. Stowe's house. Some of them were in little waggons; some were trudging along on foot after their household stuff; some led their children by the hand; and there were even mothers who walked on, suckling their infants, and weeping for the dead or kidnapped husbands they had left behind.

This road, which ran through Walnut Hills, and within a few feet of Mrs. Stowe's door, was one of the favourite routes of the "underground railroad," so often alluded to in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. This name was given to a line of Quakers and other Abolitionists, who, living at intervals of 10, 15, or 20 miles between the Ohio River and the Northern Lakes, had formed themselves into a sort of association to aid fugitive slaves in their escape to Canada. Any fugitive was taken by night on horseback or in covered wagons, from station to station, until he stood on free soil, and found the folds of the lion banner floating over him, and the artillery of the British Empire between him and Slavery. The first station north of Cincinnati was a few miles up Mill Creek, at the house of the pious and lion-hearted John Vansandt, who figures in chapter nine of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, as John Van Trompe. Mrs. Stowe must have often been roused from her sleep by the quick rattle of the covered waggons, and the confused galloping of the horses of constables and slave-catchers in hot pursuit. "Honest John" was always ready to turn out with his team, and the hunters of men were not often adroit enough to come up with him. He sleeps now in the obscure grave of a martyr. The "gigantic frame" of which the novelist speaks was worn down at last by want of sleep, exposure and anxiety; and his spirits were depressed by the persecutions which were accumulated on him. Several slave-owners who had lost their property by his means sued him in the United States Courts for damages; and judgment after judgment stripped him of his farm and all his property.

During her long residence on the frontier of the Slave States, Mrs. Stowe made several visits to them. It was then, no doubt, she made the observations which have enabled her to paint noble, generous, and humane slaveholders, in the characters of Wilson the manufacturer, Mrs. Shelby and her son George, St. Clare and his daughter Eva, the benevolent purchaser at the New Orleans auction sale, the mistress of Susan and Emeline, and Symmes, who helped Eliza and her boy up the river bank. Mrs. Stowe has observed Slavery in every phase; she has seen masters and slaves at home, New Orleans markets, fugitives, free coloured people, pro-slavery politicians and priests, Abolitionists and colonisationists. She and her family have suffered from it; seventeen years of her life have been clouded by it. For that long period, she stifled the strongest emotions of her heart. No one but her intimate friends knew their strength. She has given them expression at last. *Uncle Tom's Cabin* is the agonizing cry of feelings pent up for years in the heart of a true woman.

THE AGITATION AGAINST THE OPENING OF THE CRYSTAL PALACE ON SUNDAYS.

It has been our misfortune, every now and then, to be placed, by no act or desire of our own, in a position of apparent antagonism with a large number of those with whom we hold certain principles relating to religious liberty in common. That misfortune has usually been debited against us as a fault—or, in other words, a result due to our own wrongheadedness and pugnacity. It is hardly worth while to attempt rebutting the charge. Thus much, however, we may say in justice to our own character—that we have never sought out occasions of difference—that we always watch their approach with dread—that we invariably suffer from the contest which ensues—and that we seldom carry away with us any other trophy than that of a clear conscience of having done our duty. Whilst the *Nonconformist* continues in being, it will continue to stand by its principles, come what may.

The action proposed to be taken by various religious bodies to prevent a partial opening of "The Crystal Palace" on the Sunday, calls for some expression of opinion on our part. We would fain have avoided the question, could we have done so consistently with manliness. Certainly, it is owing to no eagerness for the fray that we venture to obtrude upon our readers the following observations. But we feel that the time is come when silence would be cowardice—and since we cannot agree with many of our friends in what they deem it right to *do* in the matter, we hold ourselves bound to give a statement of our views, and—submit to the penalty.

Let us first state the case. The Crystal Palace Company are associated together on commercial principles, to promote an object generally believed to be highly desirable and beneficial. They aim at doing a good thing, and to make it pay them for doing it. They wish to supply to the people the highest order of instructional amusement, under conditions which will be pecuniarily remunerative to themselves. Like all commercial companies, they desire to benefit themselves—but, unlike some, they propose to do so by means which will greatly benefit their fellow countrymen. Had their object been to provide wholesome domiciles for the poor, instead of elevating and refining recreation, it would not have been cast into their teeth as an offence, that they choose to make their project pay its own expense, and put a surplus into their own pockets. The Crystal Palace Company, acting on these commercial principles, apply to the government for a royal charter, the effect of which will be, to constitute the company a corporate body, able to sue, and liable to be sued, in law, and thereby to protect shareholders from individual pecuniary responsibility to the whole amount of liabilities contracted by the concern. Government, however, had been powerfully moved by a deputation headed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, not to grant the royal charter, unless the company engaged to close the palace on Sundays. The result was an offer on the part of the directors, to concede thus much to the religious feeling opposed to them—that no part of the palace or grounds should be open on Sundays before one o'clock—that only the grounds and the winter-garden should be then accessible—and that the sale of all alcoholic drinks should be prohibited. The agitation now being raised, is to prevent the granting of the royal charter, already promised, on any condition short of meeting the religious views of a considerable portion of the British public. In a word, government is being solicited to withhold a civil privilege in order to square its proceedings with certain religious convictions.

The questions arising out of this State of the case are—Ought the civil government to dispense its privileges, to those of its subjects who solicit them, on considerations arising out of religious opinion? and secondly, ought we, on Christian grounds, to require their interference? To each of these questions we propose to devote a paragraph or two.

The rights and powers of government are not absolute, but derived. They are not inherited or held in fee simple, but in trust. They are conferred for the equal advantage of *all*—they must be used, when used justly, with a view to the good of all. The general principles of justice are well understood—government is the organ for applying them. To secure every man in his individual rights and liberties against aggression, whether from fraud or force, is the business of government—beyond this, its action represents not duty, but convenience—or, in our judgment, mostly misrepresents it. Religion has rights and duties which are essentially personal—which cannot be invaded by government without injustice, which never have been invaded without evil consequences. On all subjects of religion, there is much difference of conviction and feeling—and government cannot be regulated by religious opinions, without ceasing to be a guardian of the community, and becoming a partisan of the mere section of it. Hence, it has come to be an almost universally recognised maxim, that all men should be equal before the law, irrespectively of their religious faith—or, in other words, that whatever law *may* do for them, law ought to do without regard to their spiritual creed or practice.

The Crystal Palace Company solicit from the crown a privilege wholly secular in its character, and which the crown is bound to grant or withhold, on wholly secular considerations. They do not ask to be allowed somewhat denied to others—the liberty of violating the sanctity of the Lord's Day. *They have that liberty*, irrespectively of the crown. They ask nothing at the hands of government but a charter of incorporation, which will legally individualise the company, and make the company *as such*, instead of every or any individual of whom it may consist, responsible for the risks of the undertaking. And they ask this, not in order that they may be able to keep the palace open on Sundays, for this they might do without a charter, but in order that they may be better qualified to carry out the enterprise to which they are committed. They approach the government, and solicit powers which have no reference whatever to religion, with a view to promote an undertaking which government and people alike deem desirable. At this stage, we have the intrusion of the religious world. "Impose upon the company," say they, "a religious prohibition, or refuse their application." Compel them to observe the Lord's Day, or leave their shareholders unprotected. Well, a partial, and, as we think, a very foolish—foolish for both sides—compromise has been made. The company will do part of the bidding of the religious portion of the community, but not all. This concession is to be a clause in the royal charter—and now, we are told—that by affixing her sign manual to the deed, Victoria will sanction Sabbath desecration! Let the clause extorted from the company by the religious world be expunged, and then, whatever Sabbath desecration follows, will be without that sanction.

The real question we have to determine, then, is this—Is it the business of the crown to enforce the religious observance of the Sabbath? No nice distinctions can alter the issue to be tried. Our friends agree with us that it ought *not* to *enforce* observance, neither ought it to *give facilities* for desecration. Now, it should be understood that it *gives* no facilities whatever in this instance—but, to a certain extent, and by mutual agreement, *takes some away*. The facilities sought are irrespective altogether of the Sabbath question, and are such as citizens may properly seek for proper objects—such as government may properly grant. When asked to confer these privileges upon grounds held worthy of granting them, is it or is not the business of the crown to use the prerogative with a view to prevent a certain portion of its subjects from spending the Sunday as to them may see fit? To withhold an advantage which should be equally within reach of all, for the purpose of securing a religious end, is the same in principle as to inflict a penalty for the like purpose—and the crown, had it refused its assent to religion, would but have committed the same wrong, which it is now to be petitioned to commit, and alas, alas, by our Nonconformist societies!

We come now to the larger, and by far the most interesting, question involved in the agitation just commenced — namely, ought we, on Christian grounds, to require the interference of government in this matter? We think not, for the following reasons:

For the sake of despatch, as well as with a view to limit the issue of the present controversy, we think it convenient to enumerate the points which we shall *not* contest, and which we leave the reader to decide according to his own judgment. We shall *not* discuss the divine authority on which a religious observance of the Lord's Day rests. We shall not discuss the mode in which it is to be observed. We grant, for argument's sake, all that can be advanced on these heads. Be it, if our friends so please, that the Lord's Day is divinely appointed for exclusively religious acts and exercises—that the manner in which the British churches seek to hallow it, is the right one—that all pleasure-taking, as such, is inconsistent with spiritual obedience in this matter—that the Crystal Palace, by throwing an air of decency over its proffered entertainments, will tempt many to violate their consciences, who would resist grosser enticements—that the precedent, if precedent it can justly be called, will be largely followed—and that, in no long time, England will resemble continental States in the manner of spending the Lord's Day. Be it that we are in presence of a serious evil—a contagious evil—a dangerous evil. Let all that be taken for granted, to any extent our friends may see fit to contend for. The question then remains—and it is the only one to which we direct our remarks—what is the precise nature of that evil, and how is it to be met?

The thing to be deplored, on the foregoing hypothesis, is a general distaste for the higher and more spiritual enjoyments of religion. It is not, surely, for its own sake, that the Sabbath is consecrated. The highest authority has told us that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath. A glorious privilege is placed before him, and, like every other privilege, is connected with duties. To neglect it is his loss. To undervalue it in comparison with other enjoyments in his condemnation. The Lord's Day is holy to them whose affections make it holy—to those who love it not it is nothing. Unhappily, the Christian world is for ever mistaking the worth of its own institutions, because it mistakes the scope of them. It asks for conformity even where there is no sympathy—it attaches importance to acts even when they represent no laudable motives. Parks, pleasure-grounds, tea-gardens, Sunday excursions, railways, steamboats, newspapers, reading-rooms, museums—these things, good in themselves, are viewed as evils on the Lord's Day, because so many prefer them to religious meditation and worship. They appear to suppose, that if all these external occasions of Sabbath-breaking could be got rid of, the world would be the better for it. Whereas, the true mischief is not in these things, but in the spirit which prefers them to higher and nobler enjoyment. Up to the measure of our people's appreciation of Christianity, will be our people's use of, and profit by, its institutions. Beyond this, all conformity degenerates into "a vain show."

This is a day in which symptoms alarm the churches much more than the disease they indicate. We act as men would do, who, because savages destroy books of devotion, would have them restrained from doing so, and then glory in the gain therefrom accruing to religion. The act of destroying a good book is regarded with more concern than the ignorance of heart out of which the propensity springs. A religious book is not religious to him who can neither understand nor read it—a holy day is not holy to him who does not rejoice in it. Christianity comes to change men's dispositions, not to prescribe their acts. It gives law to the heart, not to the conduct. In its view, acts are nothing *religiously* considered, but in their representative worth—conduct is of no importance, but as it expresses character. "Sabbath desecration" as the phrase is, was much more prevalent in apostolic times than in ours—but not one of the apostles mentions it as an evil to be bemoaned. Their attention was riveted upon the *spiritual darkness* to which such a state of things was natural, and their aim was to rectify men's tastes, by commanding to them higher objects.

The true evil, then, indicated by the general non-observance of the Lord's Day, is not in the things done on that day, but in the want of religious sensibility and cultivation thereby demonstrated. That so many of our fellow countrymen are devoid of spiritual taste — that they know not the highest pleasures of which their being is capable—that they feel no want of religious instruction, no delight in religious worship—that they have no conscience in reference to these engagements—that they do not, and cannot, sympathize with the object of Christian institutions—*this* is the core of mischief. And this will not be touched by meddling with the world's pleasures. You may worry, you may irritate, you may perchance madden; but you will not change the spirit of men by your numberless prohibitions.

Suppose the present agitation successful, and what will be its consequences? We shall have just the same dislike of our religious institutions as we have now, aggravated by a sense of injustice. The working classes will ask what right the religious world has to prevent their spending the Lord's Day as best pleases them, so that they do not encroach upon the rights of others? And we ask it on their behalf. What right has the Christian church to impose its institutions upon the unwilling? Of these, the Lord's Day is one. Who authorizes us to make it a Lord's Day to those who are indifferent to its claims? Baptism is another. Why should we not be equally justified in soliciting the crown to grant no commercial privileges to the unbaptised? That the opening of the Crystal Palace on the Sunday will present greater attractions to pleasure-taking than now exist, we are not disposed to conceal from ourselves—but if the religion of our day cannot withstand this test, it behoves us to see to its improvement. If our young people are in danger, we must infuse into them better principles. If our drowsy worshippers are allured to sensuous gratification, we must aim to put more life into them. More heat, more activity, more persuasiveness, more Christianity, and that of a better sort, is the true remedy. The Queen's interference will, after all, but serve to cover the evil, not to remove it. There is a stronger than she to run to in this emergency—a more effectual preventive than the power of law. One-half of the money, and one-tenth of the zeal, wasted on these periodical and fruitless agitations, if expended wisely in *winning* the sympathies of the unenlightened to religion, instead of *restraining* their pleasures, would soon place religious institutions on a more commanding footing. Whilst the method now in vogue remains so, we despair of large success. That which a chrystal palace can overturn, or a royal word establish, cannot be worth much, spiritually estimated. Two years ago Protestanism was in danger from Cardinal Wiseman's honours. Now it is in danger from a winter garden. What next? Is our Christianity so sickly, so feverish, so puny, that it must be curtained in from every blast, and shrouded from every beam of sunshine, lest its nerves should be shattered, or its complexion injured? And if so, would it not be better to look rather to the recovery of our own Christian health, than to ask for such arrangements regarding it as encroach upon the rights of the world. Let us beware lest we mistake the danger and increase it by our unwise provisions for meeting it.

We should not have written thus largely and earnestly on this topic, but for our deep conviction that just in proportion as the attention of religious society is given to mere external decencies, its inner life and vigour will ebb away. The tottering walls of our institutions cannot be shored up for long by coercive or restrictive arrangements. The way to prevent sin is to destroy it in the affections. The way to make temptations powerless is to strengthen sound principles in men's hearts. And there is no other way. All labour in other directions is lost. The world will never be *made* to do right, until the world is made right in its sympathies. Hedge it about—restrict its movements—hinder it in the pursuit of its desires—scold it—anathematise it—make law for it—and it will be none the better for your pains—rather the worse. Christianity must woo and win it to goodness in the spirit of her divine Founder—and this she will only be able to do as she is self-reliant and gentle—sure of her own power, and willing to use it benignly. Love is the secret of her success, and love cannot work by means of law. The churches will blunder on, until they have found out this. It is affirmed in theory now—it is denied in practice.—(London) *Non-Conformist.*

THE MORMONS.

From a Letter in the St. Louis *Intelligencer*, dated Great Salt Lake City, Sept. 12, 1852.

With a slash of the whip across the shoulders, and a dash of the rowels into the flanks of their respective animals, a company of young Mormon *belles* and beaux on horseback—the *belles* arrayed in long-skirted riding-dresses and green velvet caps, and the beaux in their shirt sleeves and bare necks, with slouched woollen hats upon their heads, and slips of coarse leather wrapped around the lower extremities of their legs, from the knees down, in the fashion of leggings, rush at full gallop past my window. I step to the door to observe more closely the unusual sight, and while watching with curious eye the receding figures, am reminded of my promise to sketch you a few of the peculiarities of Mormon life, manners, character and institutions, such as they have presented themselves to my mind during a residence of several weeks in the Valley. The task I have imposed upon myself is a somewhat difficult one. Where there is much ignorance and fanaticism upon the one side, and so much prejudice and contempt upon the other, it is impossible that I should in what I have to say, entirely please either Mormon or Gentile—for such the Saints term all who disagree with them in point of religious faith. Gentiles will, I dare say, attribute to me too lenient an indulgence to the abominable doctrines and hateful persons of sacriligious idolators, while Mormons will accuse me of a severity merging into persecution of God's faithful and chosen saints. It is even doubtful whether I shall myself feel altogether satisfied as to the truth and fidelity of my own impressions. But as truth and justice, and the presentation of correct and faithful impressions in regard to subjects which are beginning to excite a very general interest throughout the country are my only objects, I shall write simply as I think, careless alike who approve or who condemns.

The population of this city I should suppose to be between eight and ten thousand. That of the Valley at large I have no very reliable means of ascertaining. Upon a rude computation, based upon the best sources of information which are accessible to me, I should estimate it as ranging somewhere between twenty and thirty thousand. This population is of an altogether hybrid or heterogeneous character, being composed of emigrants from every section of the Union, and almost every country in Europe. Here are congregated the keen, sharp-witted, restless Yankee, the prudent, canny, slim-visaged Scotchman, the pursy, self-complacent, consequential Englishman, the dull, phlegmatic German, with a rare occasional specimen of a more gay, light-hearted Irishman or Frenchman, all of whom associate together in this desert-girt retreat upon terms of the most social harmony und brotherhood. I have often been amused at one of their saintly peculiarities, their manner of addressing or speaking of one another. A saint invariably salutes or speaks of a fellow-saint with the endearing appellation of Brother or Sister. This peculiarity is not confined to the elder members of the community, but extends to all ages and both sexes. I have sometimes been moved to fits of almost uncontrolable laughter with a keen sense of the ludicrous, at hearing a saintly infant of eight or twelve address his playmate, or speak of some elderly personage, by the fraternal title of Brother Zebulon or Brother Hyde, or some other kindred name. There is, however, one exception to this peculiar feature of Mormon custom. The term Brother is rarely if ever applied to the head of the Church and Governor of the Territory, Brigham Young. In speaking of this high and influential personage, the less exalted saints sometimes, when they wish to be particularly deferential, term him President Young, in virtue of his office as President of the Church. But most commonly they in familiar practice style him simply Brigham. He is seldom alluded to as Governor, the saints seeming to hold in high contempt any reflected honour which political title or station could give to the great High Priest of their faith and immediate representative of God upon earth.

English people, both men and women, form a very large proportion, I think fully one-third, perhaps one-half, of the whole community. With strict fidelity to their English origin and character, they generally constitute the most officious, self-important busy-bodies in the Valley. A rosy-cheeked, smooth-tongued Englishman, with his abdominal organs distended to a state of the most graceful rotundity from the reciprocal effects of high living upon roast beef and high steaming with strong beer and such like fluids, freshly arrived from the old country, where he had perhaps been accustomed to hold the stirrup of "my Lord John," or answer the bell of "Sir Thomas" with becoming servility, comes to Salt Lake, and soon he begins to swagger with an air of lordliness and state at the bare thought of his recent emancipation. He looks down, as the humour of the moment may prove him, with an air of unconcealed dislike or supercilious patronage, upon the native sons of America, who may chance to be passing through, or stopping a short time in the Valley. Generally he delights to cherish treasonable sentiments against the Government and authority of the United States, and sometimes dares so far as to give vent to his treasonable feelings in expressions of disrespect and contumely toward the Chief Magistrate and other high officers of the nation. Such characters are not unfrequently to be met with in this place. Do not understand me as disposed to indulge in any tirade against England or the English people. Next to the Government and people of our own country, I admire and venerate the institutions of Old England. But there is a vast difference betwen the the accomplished cultivated English gentleman and the rude ignorant English boor. The one, is one of the most agreeable, fascinating companions in the world; the other, the most intolerably provoking and disagreeable character with which a gentleman can be brought in contact. Unfortunately many, very many, of the English in the Salt Lake Valley belong to this latter class. There are a number of Welsh in the Valley, who generally live in the country at some distance from the city. They generally constitute a very industrious and sober class of the community.

Of the American portion of the population, by far the greater number came from New York, and the other Middle and Eastern States. Occasionally a representative from the various Southern and Western States is to be found among their numbers. How a Missourian, or Kentuckian, or Carolinian, could ever have strayed off to these comparatively unknown wilds to unite himself to the Mormon Church, is a mystery, which, I confess, quite altogether surpasses my comprehension. Yet here they are to be found. The Mormons almost universally belong to what are usually denominated the lower or labouring classes of society in the States and countries where they originally resided. The state of learning and intelligence prevailing among them generally, I should judge, by the appearance and conversation of most of those who came under my observation, to be at a very low standard, while many, very many of them, are destitute of the first rudiments of a common English education, being rude and ignorant to a very high degree. I do not recollect to have either met or seen among them a single person whose appearance, manners or speech, would indicate him as a gentleman of refined, cultivated or even educated mind. I do not except from this remark either the President, Governor Young, or any of the other leaders of the Church. And yet there are not a few men among them of naturally keen, shrewd, strong intellects. But if the natural intelligence of the Mormons is none the most penetrating, their acquired knowledge none the most perfect, or their manners the most polished, they possess, as in some measure a compensation for these deficiencies, those two cardinal virtues of the classes from which they sprung, industry and sobriety, to a very remarkable degree. If external manifestations are to be taken as true types of inward feeling and character, energy, perseverance and sobriety are certainly prominent, not to say predominant, traits of the Mormon character.

Every Mormon has some employment, and what is more, usually prosecutes it with praiseworthy assiduity. An idle or drunken Mormon is a social phenomenon which has not yet fallen under my eye. There are but few liquor shops in the city. I believe that these are rarely entered by any but emigrants and transient residents. The streets of the city are quiet and orderly at all hours, both of the day and night.

As an illustration of Mormon enterprise and perseverance, I will mention a well-authenticated fact in their history. Within an hour after the first adventurers had entered the Valley in 1847, some of them had hitched their horses to the plow, and were engaged in turning the sod, while others were occupied in digging ditches and making other preparations for irrigation. Generally speaking I have found them civil, and not indisposed to give me all the information I sought in regard to the principal features of their religious and social organization. In regard to the honesty of their character and conduct, it is the fashion of most of the Gentiles to doubt and distrust it. Possibly I may have fallen somewhat into the prevailing fashion in this respect, but I must candidly admit that in my limited dealings with them I saw nothing to cause me to believe that the Mormons were in their business transactions either better or worse than other people.

Having said thus much of the men, I must of course devote a few words to the women or ladies of Salt Lake. With all due regard to the obligations of gallantry and deference to the rights of the sex, I cannot say that the Mormon ladies can lay claim to any superiority over their lords and masters, the Saints, either in appearance, manners or education. With some very few exceptions they generally impressed me as having sprung from inferior grades of society. Whatever may be their other virtues, which it is fair to presume are not a few, beauty, refined and delicate features, and graceful manners are most certainly not of the number.

I may be permitted, without overstepping the bounds of propriety or encroaching upon the prerogatives of the sex, to say that a swain must be most deplorably persecuted with the darts of Cupid, indeed, who could fall in love with a Mormon lady at first sight. Mormon ladies, like those of other communities, are fond of making such little display of finery and fashion in dress, as is at their command. The styles in vogue vary as widely as the different costumes and usages of the various countries from whence they came. A favourite peculiarity of dress with many of them is to wear chip or Leghorn hats, somewhat after the fashion of those worn by Swiss and Italian peasant women, instead of bonnets. These sometimes serve to give some degree of piquancy to faces otherwise quite insipid or repugnant in their expression of features. The efforts of some of the beauties, both young and old, to make a fashionable display of their charms, is somewhat grotesque in the extreme.

The position of the women here is altogether secondary to hat of men. Perhaps were I to say that the women were in a state of entire and absolute subjection to the men, the term would be more truly expressive of the actual state of the relations existing between them. According to the creed which they have mutually adopted, a woman stands no chance of earthly happiness or spiritual salvation, unless she is married, or, in their parlance, *sealed* to a man. The men thus holding in their hands the keys of the women's fate, are not restricted in the number of those to whom they will with princely liberality and Christian charity extend the blessing of happiness and salvation, while poor woman is forced, under heavy penalties, even that of death, to confine herself to the sovereign rights of but one husband.

This is a right and privilege which many of the Saints avail themselves of to its fullest extent. Bigamy or polygamy is a cardinal doctrine in the faith, and a main feature in the practice of the Mormons. It is acknowledged and practiced openly and without disguise. Many of the Saints consider their liberality and capabilities sufficiently large to justify them in taking under their saintly protection as many as ten or twelve, or even more wives, who are then denominated Spirituals. To entitle them to enter into this State of relative Lordship and dependence, the consent of the President, Brigham Young, has to be first obtained, and then some qualified form or ceremony of marriage to be gone through with. The number of Spirituals attached to Governor Young's immediate household, and those over whom he exercises sovereign rights, it is impossible to determine. I have, however seen his carriage or omnibus repeatedly drive up to the Church door of a Sunday filled with a dozen or more dames—old, middle aged and young—all of whom, I am told, claim to be his well-beloved and honoured wives. Besides these, I am informed that he has numerous other wives quartered in various parts of the city. Being the head of the community, I presume that he has the pick of the flock. If such is the case, I cannot say that I entertain any very extravagant admiration for his taste in female beauty.

The other leading Saints, I am told, have wives or spirituals, proportionate in number to their dignity and standing in the Church. These spirituals usually reside upon the same premises with their lords; some favourite wife usually occupying the principal mansion, while the others are quartered near by, in small cottages or out-buildings erected for their accommodation. Sometimes the family becomes so large as to imperatively require a division, and they are then settled in diverse directions, the husband visiting the one or the other as taste and inclination may lead him. Strange to say these numerous joint tenants, if I may use a legal phrase, of one lord most generally live together upon terms of the best understanding and most complete harmony. The green-eyed monster seems to have entirely overlooked the ladies of Salt Lake, in his round of terrestial visitations. Such a thing as a spiritual Kilkenny fight is a thing wholly unheard of and unsuspected in the annals of Mormonism.

As might be expected, the Mormons permit only a very guarded and restricted intercourse between their families and the Gentiles. With oriental jealousy they seem to doubt and distrust any and all social attentions upon the part of Strangers to their wives and daughters. In fact, they generally utterly forbid the Mormon young ladies to engage in any association whatever with the young Gentiles of the city. But unlike their great prototypes, the cautious and suspicious Mussulmen, they have no eunuchs of terocious aspect and gigantic proportions to officiate as custodians of the sancity of their domicils, and the precious treasures they contain. I think that very many of them might save themselves a world of doubt, anxiety and trouble, by the simple reflection, that where the temptation is weak, acts of transgression and crime are proportionately small.

The chief glory and consolation of the ladies, in the dearth of their other privileges, would seem to consist in the honour which they enjoy, to the most liberal extent, of becoming the mothers of an endless multitude of infant Saints, or Gods, as they impiously call themselves and their offspring. The number of children in the Valley is quite incalculable. It surpasses all belief. Almost every lady who has attained the age of womanhood carries one of those juvenile responsibilities in her arms. From this, some idea of the rapidly-growing population of Salt Lake may be obtained. These godlike infants are usually honoured, shortly after birth, with some odd biblical or other quaint name, such as Zebulon, Erastus, Jerediah, Nehemiah, Naptha, and Tamar, and so on.

I have been a regular attendant once or twice every Sabbath, since I have been here, at the only house of worship in the place. The character and ceremonial of the services bear a strong similitude to those of several of the Protestant denominations. The services are first opened with prayer: then follows a hymn sung in a kind of operatic chant, by a choir of not very musical or cultivated looking songsters, male and female, to the accompaniment of violins, clarionets, flutes, and several other varieties of musical instruments. After this comes the sermon, or sermons, by one or more of the Elders. When these are through, miscellaneous subjects are introduced, and then the congregation is dismissed with prayer. The pulpit is generally occupied by the President, two Vice Presidents, and twelve Apostles, and occasionally other leading Elders, some of whom commonly address the assembled multitude as may be agreed upon at the moment, without previous preparation.

A Sunday or two since I had the pleasure of hearing a sermon upon the plurality of wives, from Brother Orson Pratt, as well as the reading of the original revelation to Joseph Smith upon the same subject, by President Young. From these I gathered a clearer insight into the mysteries of Mormon theology then I had ever had before. The Mormons believe in the authenticity of the Old Testament, and in the divine character, mission and revelations of Jesus Christ. But they further believe that similar revelations of the divine will were made to Joseph Smith, and are now being made, as circumstances require, to Brigham Young and the other patriarchs of the Church. The Mormons believe in polytheism as well as polygamy. The two go hand in hand. The one creates and proves the necessity of the other. According to the original ideas of their theology, they are themselves all Gods and the progenitors of Gods, varying in power, intelligence and dignity, who have humiliated themselves for a while by appearing upon the earth and assuming a human form.

One of their great duties in their humiliated character is to propagate their species, and people not only this, but also worlds unnumbered and uncreated with their descendants, Gods like themselves. Hence the great necessity and reason for the adoption of the system of the plurality of wives, for the more speedy accomplishment of this, the great object of their being. After death they will ascend to heaven, resume their original godship, and there live a state of perpetual beatific enjoyment, surrounded by their numerous wives and posterity. In their belief there is no such place as a separate distinct hell. Hell consists simply in the deprivation of those who are unworthy from the joys and pleasures of heaven. I wish that I had time to give you a brief sketch of many of the novel views and ideas developed in this original and characteristic sermon. I think that you would find it both curious and interesting, and gain from it a more perfect and satisfactory idea of the peculiarities of this strange religion that you could from almost any other source.

One singular idea advanced by Mr. Pratt in this discourse I cannot refrain from mentioning. That was, that the principle reason why the people of the United States and Europe did not adopt the system of a plurality of wives was that they were too avaricious and penurious to support such large families; that they were fast becoming too fond of gold to support even a single wife and her offspring. This explanation of a custom which has heretofore been attributed to virtuous principle upon the part of our people and Europeans, will undoubtedly surprise and shock not a few of them. The Saints are using every endeavour to make proselytes to their religion. They are sending out missionaries, with that object, to every quarter of the globe. In a few days some eighty or ninety of these apostles of Mormonism will depart upon their missions, some destined to the various States of the Union, others to the different countries in Europe, and others yet to China, Hindostan, Australia, the Sandwich Islands, and other remote regions. They are generally selected promiscuously from the community of Saints at large, and are sometimes called upon to depart upon these distant missions with not more than a week or ten days notice, and without pay or reward. This duty they usually perform with cheerfulness and alacrity. Mr. Pratt, who delivered the sermon to which I have alluded, accompanies the party on a mission to Washington City, where he goes to edit a Mormon paper. Through the columns of his journal, I presume that the public will be fully enlightened as to all the more important points of Mormon theology, including the doctrine of spiritual wives as well as others.

In point of political feeling, I believe that there is little or no genuine American spirit or sentiment among the Mormons. If they ever entertained any feelings of attachment to the Government and institutions of the country, I am satisfied that a succession of what they regard as gross persecutions and hostilities upon the part of the people of several States, has almost if not totally eradicated it from their minds. They are undoubtedly suspicious and unfriendly to the great body of the citizens of the United States. Such being their feelings towards the people, it is but natural to conclude that the same doubts and dislike extend to the Government which that people maintain and control. That treasonable feelings and sentiments toward the National Government prevail in this community to a much greater extent than is generally supposed in the States, is a fact of which I feel perfectly convinced.

If these feelings have not yet manifested themselves in open acts of rebellion, or disrespect of the authority of the Government, it is mainly because they are not yet sufficiently confident of their strength, or have not deemed the provocation sufficiently great to justify them in taking so decided a course. I believe that a few years increase in strength, and a propitious occasion, will develop these feelings to the conviction of everybody. I base my opinion not so much upon any positive acts or expressions that I have either heard or seen, as upon the general turn and character of their conversation, and information derived from the most credible sources. The conduct of the returning United States officers, in deserting their post at the time they did, is universally condemned here by all persons with whom I have conversed upon the subject. They left at the most critical period, when they stood in no immediate danger of personal violence, and by their presence might have caused such a positive development of the true feelings and intentions of the Mormons toward the Government as would have enabled it to take hold of and crush their treason in the very bud.

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

Lord Derby, the English Premier, has published a little work, entitled Conversations on the Parables of the New Testament, for the use of children.

—A subscription has been commenced for a memorial window in honour of the poet Wordsworth, in the church now rebuilding in Cockermouth, the town of his birth. Some members of the Whittington Club intend raising a memorial over the hithorto neglected grave of poor Tom Hood, at Kensal-green Cemetery.

—Boston Anti-Slavery Bazaar.—We are requested, on behalf of the Edinburgh Ladies' Emancipation Society, to thank those Friends of the Slave who have already so kindly and liberally responded to former advertisements, by sending Contributions both in work and money; so that there is likely to be a greater collection of articles sent from Edinburgh, than for some years past. It will be seen from an Advertisement, that the time for receiving Contributions is extended from the 1st to the 9th of Eleventh Month.—*British Friend.*

—Anti-Militia Placards.—In Buckinghamshire, a bill-sticker, named Barron, has been held to bail to appear the sessions, to answer a charge of having posted some placards intending to dissuade men from enlisting in the militia. At Great Bardfield, a clerical gentleman became so much excited by the exhibition of one of the placards on the shutters of one of his neighbours, who was a Friend, that he discharged the contents of a double-barrelled fowling-piece at the document, completely obliterating it of course, but at the same time doing serious injury to the window-fastenings upon which it was posted.—(Glasgow) *Birish Friend.*

—A "Foreign Ambassador" at Southampton.—An inhabitant of Pitcairn's Island (celebrated as the residence of the mutineers of the Bounty) has arrived at Southampton, having despatches from Admiral Moresby, in the Pacific Ocean, and hoping to induce the government to allow English ships of war to visit the island oftener than they now do. He is about 60 years of age, and about 25 years ago visited Pitcairn, and was allowed to remain on the island as a religious teacher and to practice medicine. The inhabitants numbered, when he left, 86 females and 88 males, nearly all descended of the Bounty mutineers and Tahitan women. They are still remarkable for their moral and religious character, chiefly through the teaching and example of Adams, the chief mutineer. A president of the community is elected every year, but he has little to do. All the land is held in common, and no one is allowed to trade for himself. The ambassador himself has been elected president of the island more than once. His business in England will chiefly be with the Duke of Northumberland and the Bishop of London. The attention of the islanders is turned to Norfolk Island about 1,600 miles distant.

—Female Heroism.—"One day," said Massena, "being at Ruezenden, I perceived a young soldier belonging to the light artillery, whose horse had just been wounded by a lance. The young man, who appeared quite a child, defended himself desperately, as several bodies of the enemy lying around him could testify. I despatched an officer with some men to his assistance, but they arrived too late. Although this action had taken place on the borders of the wood, and in front of the bridge, this artilleryman had alone withstood the attack of a small troop of Cossacks and Bavarians, whom the officer and men I had despatched put to flight. His body was covered with wounds, inflicted by shots, lances, and swords. There were at least thirty. And do you know, madame, what the young man was?" said Massena, turning to me.

"A woman."

"Yes, a woman, and a handsome woman, too! although she was so covered with blood that it was difficult to judge of her beauty. She had followed her lover to the army. The latter was a captain of artillery; she never left him; and when he was killed, defended like a lioness the remains of him she loved. She was a native of Paris; her name was Louise Belletz, and she was the daughter of a fringe-maker in the Rue de Petit Lion."—*Memoirs of the Duchess Abrantes.*

—A Race of Red Men Reported in Western Africa.—The *Nouvelles Annales des Voyages* for June contains a translation by Cherbonneau, Professor of Arabic at Constantine, of the journey of a traveller named Tuggar, *via* Timbuctoo, to the Mountains of the Moon. These mountains, however, according to this account, do not lie in Middle or Eastern Africa, as laid down in our geographies, but among the Western Highlands which fill the space between the middle course of the Niger and Atlantic Ocean. The route taken was from Timbuctoo to Duchene, up the Niger, then for some time upon the Niger, and finally by land to Bambara, Sakay, Makka and Sakat. Then follows the ensuing passage:—

"Beyond the circle of Sakat begins, so to speak, a new world; the people have a red colour, of whom a part are herdsmen, possessing innumerable herds of camels and flocks of sheep, the remainder are husbandmen. One travels some two months upon the territory, and then comes to a great salt lake called Sebkat Sebanaktha. This lake loses itself in the sands of a boundless desert, in which one finds no traces of vegetation. Across this desert, the passage of which occupies five weeks, dwell nations of a red colour, living in tents made of buffalo skins, and subsisting on dates and camels' milk. Then comes a second waste, which can be crossed in fifteen days; after which occur the first oasis, which belong to the Mountains of the Moon, and are inhabited by redmen."